



JX1932
.L19
1903-1907

REPORT

OF THE

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE

ON

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

1903

REPORTED BY WILLIAM J. ROSE

PUBLISHED BY
THE LAKE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE

1903

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

OF THE

NINTH ANNUAL LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, 1903

President: HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, Washington, D. C.

Secretary to the Conference: CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Permanent Corresponding Secretary: H. C. PHILLIPS, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.

Stenographer: WILLIAM J. ROSE, Boston, Mass.

Treasurer: ALEXANDER C. WOOD, Camden, N. J.

Auditors: JOHN B. GARRETT, Rosemont, Pa.; HON. WM. J. COOMBS, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Business Committee: JOHN CROSBY BROWN, New York, *Chairman*; HON. ALDEN CHESTER, Albany, N. Y.; REV. DR. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Providence, R. I.; HON. JOHN I. GILBERT, Malone, N. Y.; MAHLON N. KLINE, Philadelphia, Pa.; HON. M. P. KNOWLTON, Springfield, Mass.; HON. H. B. F. MACFARLAND, Washington, D. C.; VIRGINIUS NEWTON, Richmond, Va.; HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, Boston, Mass.; HON. WILLIAM L. PENFIELD, Washington, D. C.; DANIEL SMILEY, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.; BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Boston, Mass.; HON. EVERETT P. WHEELER, New York; CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Publication Committee: BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Boston, *Chairman*; H. C. PHILLIPS, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.

Press Committee: L. A. MAYNARD, New York, *Chairman*; H. L. BRIDGMAN, Brooklyn, N. Y.; H. W. HORWILL, New York; CHARLES E. KELSEY, Boston, Mass.; A. MAURICE LOW, Washington, D. C.; BLISS PERRY, Boston, Mass.; EDWARD J. WHEELER, New York.

Finance Committee: JOHN B. GARRETT, Rosemont, Pa., *Chairman*; EDWIN GINN, Boston, Mass.; HON. W. MARTIN JONES, Rochester, N. Y.; CHARLES RICHARDSON, Philadelphia, Pa.; JAMES TALCOTT, New York; WARNER VAN NORDEN, New York.

PREFACE

The Ninth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was held, on the invitation of Mr. Albert K. Smiley, at the Lake Mohonk House, Ulster County, N. Y., May 27, 28 and 29, 1903, and was attended by two hundred and fifty persons. There were six sessions of the Conference. This Report contains the stenographic account of the proceedings, which consisted of addresses and discussions on the history of arbitration, the work of the Hague Court during the past year, the relations of commerce and industry to peace, the best methods of promoting public opinion in favor of arbitration, and kindred topics.

One copy of this Report is sent to each member of the Conference. If other copies are desired, application should be made to Mr. Smiley.

THE NINTH LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

First Session.

Wednesday Morning, May 27, 1903.

The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration met for its ninth annual session, by invitation of Hon. Albert K. Smiley, in the parlor of the Lake Mohonk House, on the 27th of May, 1903, at 10 o'clock.

Mr. Smiley opened the Conference, at the close of the usual morning service of prayer, and welcomed the guests who had assembled. He said :

MR. SMILEY : I cannot tell you how glad I am to see you all. This is the thirty-first conference held here ; it is the ninth Conference on International Arbitration. There have been twenty conferences of the friends of the Indian and two in the interests of the negroes. But this is by far the largest collection of men and women we have ever had together. It is a very choice collection. We have in this Conference about twenty-five jurists, twenty-five clergymen, forty business men, and representatives of the press, of the army and navy, and also diplomats.

We are glad that you have left your work behind and come up here to discuss international arbitration. There has been wonderful progress this last year, and that gives me great hope. I should be so glad in my lifetime to see international arbitration a thoroughly accomplished thing. It is in the air and spirit of the day ; nations are getting better acquainted, and it looks as if the dream of the optimists were coming rapidly to fruition.

I would just say that those who were here last year know what a successful presiding officer we had, — the foremost man in this country, without any question, if not in the world, on the subject of international arbitration. We were so well pleased with him that we made up our minds that he must be here and preside this year, and therefore I nominate the Hon. John W. Foster as the presiding officer of this meeting.

Mr. Foster took the chair amid applause, and said :

HON. JOHN W. FOSTER : *Ladies and Gentlemen* : I had a private interview with our host this morning, and I thought I was going to

have something good to tell you, but he has already told you what he told me as to his impressions of the body of men and women who are gathered here to-day ; so I need not repeat it.

I have been elected presiding officer, and I may be permitted to express the hope that we will so conduct ourselves that our worthy host will not change his mind about us when we leave.

I have been told that a part of my business as presiding officer is to make an opening address, and that part of the program is the first in order. I am going to set those who follow me a good example, and be brief in what I say.

The President then made the following address :

OPENING ADDRESS OF THE HON. JOHN W. FOSTER. PRESIDENT.

We assemble to-day for the Ninth Annual Mohonk Conference of the friends of international arbitration under most encouraging auspices. Very significant events have taken place since we separated at this beautiful spot one year ago. These events have tended in the direction of universal peace and have greatly strengthened the cause of arbitration.

At our last conference it was announced that the governments of the United States and Mexico were just concluding an agreement for the submission to the Hague Tribunal of a question much discussed and of long standing. That case has already been submitted to the Tribunal, and with a promptness and celerity almost unknown in international judicatures a decision has been rendered. Although the amount of the award is large, the debtor nation has cheerfully accepted the decision. Even for her the result was so much more satisfactory than the constant irritation growing out of the continued agitation of the question, that it was better to pay the award, even though regarded as inequitable, and be at peace with her neighbor.

Probably the most edifying and auspicious event has occurred in a quarter of the world to which the Anglo-Saxons have not been inclined to look for helpful examples in good government and salutary public law. In the extreme of the South American continent there have arisen into prominence during the last century two prosperous and aspiring republics. As a rule they have sustained good administration, maintained excellent foreign credit, and have greatly advanced in wealth and resources. For a time they arrayed themselves in a rivalry for supremacy on that continent, and, following the example of the greater nations they largely increased their armies and navies. A controversy over a boundary line threatened to light the torch of war and thrust these two peaceful, prosperous and industrious peoples into a sanguinary and exhausting conflict. But better counsels prevailed, and Chile and Argentina agreed to submit the boundary

question to the arbitration of the King of England. His award has been rendered and accepted by both nations.

But that is only the beginning of the narrative. The two nations have entered into a treaty whereby they agree to submit all questions which cannot be settled by diplomacy to arbitration, the only exception being those involving principles of their constitutions. They further agreed to stop the construction of naval vessels and to sell those which were ordered at the time the war fever was raging; and as a result there are now in the naval dockyards of Europe several war vessels of the two nations seeking customers. They also agreed to reduce their armies to a peace footing and so to maintain them, and partially to disarm their naval vessels at home.

As a result of this disarmament, we are informed by recent press news from Buenos Ayres that the Minister of Marine has tendered to the Minister of Agriculture two of his unoccupied men-of-war to transport grain and meat products to South Africa, where the government is seeking to open up a new market for their superabundant harvests. With a slight change in the biblical metaphor, may we regard this as the beginning of that millennium era foretold by the ancient prophet, when the people "shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more"?

From these far-away countries, where we have been so prone to expect war and disorder, comes this inspiring and hopeful example. They are a people, too, of a different religion and race from most of us, — Catholics, not Protestants; Spanish-Americans of the Latin race, not the boastful Anglo-Saxon. May we not learn from this to be a little more charitable in our criticism of the countries to the south of us, in their struggles to free themselves from the customs which enchained them during so many centuries of misrule?

Some notice must be taken of the Venezuelan complication, for in it there may be found edification for this Conference. Three of the most powerful nations of the world combined in a hostile demonstration against one of the feeblest of the smaller nations. The alleged cause of this combined armed expedition was one for which neither of them, nor all three combined, would have had the temerity to make war against any nation with even moderate military resources. When in 1861 the United States was solicited by three of the great nations of Europe to unite with them in an armed demonstration against Mexico for a similar reason, Secretary Seward replied that our government was not disposed to enter upon warlike measures to enforce claims against a friendly power. Such a reason for hostilities has certainly not gained in strength with the lapse of half a century of enlightenment. The point which I wish to emphasize is that the public sentiment of the world, and especially of the British people, brought those three powerful nations to a halt. It is encouraging to know that in this era it is not so easy to inaugurate or prosecute an unjust war as it was a century or more ago.

On the other hand, the event shows some of the evil effects of

transforming the populous nations into great military powers. While the vast naval armaments and standing armies of Great Britain, Germany, Russia and other nations make them very cautious about provoking each other to a conflict, they offer a temptation to occupy these forces in expeditions and adventures against the weaker nations. There was little risk to Germany, Great Britain and Italy in seizing or sinking the infantile flotilla of Venezuela and in bombarding its antiquated forts. Hence, in the interest of the weaker nations and of the world's peace, it is of the utmost importance that a public sentiment be created among the enlightened nations, which will restrain the great military powers from entering upon schemes of adventure or oppression, and which will support the smaller independent nations in their appeal to arbitration for the settlement of their differences with the more powerful.

In this connection it is gratifying to us as Americans to note the attitude of our government in the existing controversy of the European nations with China. After they, by their territorial aggressions upon that empire, had provoked its people to rise in blind resentment against foreigners, and then punished them by the levy of an enormous indemnity, they insisted with this helpless nation upon the exaction of the last "pound of flesh" by a technical construction of the protocol, which made it annually more and more difficult for the empire to comply with its terms. It was a generous and magnanimous act on the part of Secretary Hay to construe the protocol most favorably to China, and to support heartily that government in its appeal for submission of the question in dispute to the Hague Tribunal. How it would exalt the Christian nations in the eyes of those whom we style the heathen if this appeal should be granted!

The Venezuela imbroglio has also served to bring into prominence the value of arbitration and the utility of the Hague Tribunal. It was a high compliment to President Roosevelt to be solicited to act as arbitrator in that dispute. But it enhanced his reputation still more to decline the offer, and to refer the contending parties to the tribunal which his own government has done so much to create.

In no country did this act of President Roosevelt receive greater commendation than in France, some of whose representatives at the Hague Conference were the most ardent supporters of the scheme adopted by that body. Only a few days ago the press announced that the interparliamentary arbitration organization had received some notable accessions from the ranks of public men, and that the cause of international arbitration had been given a new impetus in that enlightened country.

Not the least of the events of the past year tending to peace is the treaty between the governments of the United States and Great Britain to refer the controverted question of the Alaskan boundary to a mixed tribunal of American and British jurists. It is not an arbitration and, from the state of the question and of public sentiment in the United States, could not well be such. It is an illustration of the fact that even so excellent a principle as arbitration has

its limitations in practice. It was not possible to have secured a treaty to entrust the settlement of the Alaskan boundary to the award of a neutral foreign arbitrator. It may sound strange to be told that some of the most earnest advocates of the Hague Tribunal were strongly opposed to the Alaskan boundary treaty. But I regard it as a wise measure, and one which redounds to the credit of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay. It provides a safe method of adjusting a long pending and vexed question, which threatened to disturb the relations of neighbors who ought to be the closest friends; and I entertain the confident expectation that the six distinguished jurists to whom the matter is referred will find a solution honorable to both parties.

Should it have this greatly to be desired outcome, it cannot fail to increase the prospects of a permanent arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain. It will be remembered that six years ago Secretary Olney and Lord Pauncefote signed a general arbitration convention to continue for five years only, but it failed to receive the approval of the Senate, largely because of this boundary dispute. The Alaskan boundary treaty approved by the Senate last February is the method of settlement provided in the Olney-Pauncefote convention. If it shall prove effective, we may have renewed hope of seeing at no distant day a general arbitration treaty between these two kindred peoples who have a common heritage and a common mission in the world. It must not be that the twin Latin republics of South America shall put us to very shame, when we are claiming to hold aloft as a model for all peoples our much vaunted Anglo-Saxon civilization. One of the chief objects of the present Conference is to influence public opinion in favor of arbitration, and I trust that one of the subjects to be discussed will be the best method of creating a growing and widespread sentiment throughout the country in support of this beneficent measure.

Let us concentrate our efforts in favor of a general arbitration treaty between the American and British governments on the lines of the unratified convention of 1897. To this end public sentiment should be brought to bear upon the Senate of the United States. That distinguished body is a fair representation of the American people, and when the latter shall express themselves as favorable to such a treaty, the Senate will ratify their verdict. Let us concentrate our efforts to bring about that greatly desired result.

At the conclusion of the President's opening address the Conference proceeded to complete its organization.

On motion, Mr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff was elected Secretary of the Conference.

Mr. Smiley announced that Mr. H. C. Phillips had been chosen permanent Corresponding Secretary.

On motion, Mr. Alexander C. Wood was reëlected Treasurer.

On motion, the following Business Committee was elected: John Crosby Brown, Chairman, Hon. Alden Chester, President W. H. P. Faunce, Hon. John I. Gilbert, Mahlon N. Kline, Hon. M. P. Knowlton, Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland, Virginius Newton, Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Hon. Wm. L. Penfield, Daniel Smiley, Benjamin F. Trueblood, Hon. Everett P. Wheeler and Clinton Rogers Woodruff.

On motion, an Auditing Committee of two was elected, namely, John B. Garrett and Hon. Wm. J. Coombs.

On motion, the following Finance Committee was elected: John B. Garrett, Chairman, Edwin Ginn, Hon. W. Martin Jones, Charles Richardson, James Talcott, Warner VanNorden.

On motion, the following Press Committee was elected: L. A. Maynard, Chairman, H. L. Bridgman, H. W. Horwill, Chas. E. Kelsey, A. Maurice Low, Bliss Perry, Edward J. Wheeler.

On motion, Benjamin F. Trueblood and H. C. Phillips were elected a Publication Committee.

On motion, William J. Rose was reëlected stenographer of the Conference.

At the conclusion of the organization the President introduced Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, who presented the following paper, which he had been invited by Mr. Smiley to prepare.

ANOTHER YEAR'S PROGRESS IN ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D.

The past year has not been one of surprises in arbitration events, but it has been one of steady and most encouraging progress. In the French Chamber of Deputies on the 10th of March last, Mr. Delcassé, Minister of Foreign Affairs, speaking of the movement in favor of arbitration, said that "it was nothing less than a revolution which was taking place." But this revolution has been going forward in a quiet and undemonstrative way since our Conference last year. When we met here at Mohonk a year ago the agreement of the governments of the United States and Mexico to refer the Pious Fund controversy to the Hague Court had just been announced. A few weeks later a tribunal consisting of five of the ablest living international jurists was chosen from the Court, and the case was presented by the agents and counsel of the two countries, and quickly and inexpensively determined.

The ink was scarcely dry with which the decision of this case was written when an agreement was reached between Japan, on the one hand, and Great Britain, France and Germany, on the other, to carry the so-called Japanese House Tax case to the Court. This case, in

which is involved the question of the right under international law to tax improvements on land held by foreigners under perpetual lease, and bringing as it does four of the great powers of the world before the tribunal, will prove probably of even greater weight in giving prestige to the Court than the Pious Fund case. This House Tax case is now actually before a tribunal of three of the Hague judges.

In addition to these cases, a protocol for the reference of the question of preferential treatment between the belligerent debt collectors and the pacific creditor nations, growing out of the recent Venezuela trouble, has just been signed. The principle involved in this case, like that in the Japanese House Tax case, is sure to be of far-reaching importance in the future relations of the nations. The practically universal demand throughout the civilized world for the reference of the whole Venezuela difficulty to the Hague Court, and the vigorous support of this demand by the government of the United States, make the victory gained by arbitration in connection with it one of the most signal ever won in the field of diplomacy. The result is almost certain to be the greater willingness of the powers in general to submit their disputes to the jurisdiction of the Hague Court.

Within a few weeks it has been announced from Paris that the French government and that of Guatemala have reached an agreement to refer to The Hague the question of the claims of a French engineer against Guatemala.

The reference of these four cases during the year, and within two years from the opening of the Court for business, is proof enough that this great international institution is not to die of neglect, as some have feared, but is sure to come with comparative rapidity into general use.

It was not to be expected that the nations would immediately submit to The Hague all controversies arising between them after the Court's inauguration, or at any rate only those ill-informed and lacking in historic sense supposed that such would be the case. Within the past year the following controversies have been referred to special arbitrators or commissions, namely :

The controversy between Italy and Guatemala as to the treatment of Italian emigrants.

The question of claims of citizens of France against Venezuela.

The boundary dispute between Bolivia and Peru.

The controversy between the United States and San Domingo over the claims of the San Domingo Improvement Company.

The question between Great Britain and Portugal of any difficulties that may arise in locating their colonial boundaries in South Africa.

The question of the claims of Sala & Company of New York against the Republic of San Domingo.

The Alaskan boundary dispute between the United States and Great Britain, which has been referred to a new mixed commission.

The year has been most fruitful in the decision of cases referred to

arbitration before the Hague Court was set up. The most important of the cases are the following:

The long pending boundary dispute between Chile and the Argentine Republic, involving an area of eighty thousand square miles.

The controversy between the United States and Russia over the seizure of American sealing vessels in Bering Sea.

The Samoan claims question between the United States, Great Britain and Germany, and citizens of these countries.

Two controversies between Great Britain and France — the "Waima" affair and the "Sergent Malamine" dispute.

The El Triunfo case between the United States and Salvador, out of the decision of which has grown a good deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the latter country.

It is not possible to give any very definite information at this time as to the progress made in the ratification of the arbitration conventions drawn at the International American Conference held something over a year ago in Mexico City. Very little seems to have been done in this direction, due in large measure to the disturbed conditions in parts of South America for several months of the year, and in part also to the fact that time is always required for the completion of such conventions, especially when a large group of nations is involved. The Congress of Guatemala has approved the arbitration conventions signed at the Conference. Our own State Department sent these conventions to the Senate for ratification, but so far that body has done nothing with them. Nothing further seems to have been done. The delay must not, however, be interpreted to mean that the protocols, at least the most important one, — that of adhesion to the Hague conventions, — will not ultimately be ratified. We may reasonably expect that in the near future the ratification of these conventions will be taken up and carried out by the governments whose representatives signed them at Mexico City.

Not much has been done toward the completion of the treaties drawn soon after the close of the Pan-American Conference between Spain and the majority of the Spanish-American republics. Two or three of these agreements are reported to have been ratified, but the public has not been informed in regard to the prospects of the remainder of them.

Turning to the general arbitration movement, a good deal of valuable work has been done within the last twelve months. All the arbitration and peace societies have kept prominently before their constituency, and the general public as far as possible, the great importance of bringing the Hague Court into general use, as nearly as practicable for all cases of international disagreement, and of inducing the various governments to enter into special treaties by which they shall obligate themselves to refer their differences to The Hague. The national groups of the Interparliamentary Peace Union in Europe have also been active in most cases in this way. Effort in

the same direction has likewise been put forth by many other organizations and by prominent individuals in this and other countries.

A strong movement has been going on in France and England among commercial bodies in many of the leading cities in favor of an Anglo-French arbitration treaty. This movement, valuable as it is in its general aim, is not receiving the support of many of the leading friends of arbitration, because the principal movers in it are pleading for a special Anglo-French tribunal with only Englishmen and Frenchmen as judges. This sort of a tribunal is earnestly opposed by many in both countries, on the ground that it is needless and in addition would be a great weakening of the value and prestige of the Hague Tribunal.

A recent movement has taken place in the French Chamber of Deputies which gives promise of greatly strengthening the cause of arbitration in general and of the Hague Court in particular. A number of the leading members of the Chamber, on the initiative of Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, who represented France at the Hague Conference and is now a member of the Hague Court, have formed themselves into an association to be called the International Arbitration Group. The remarkable strength of arbitration in the French Parliament is shown by the fact that nearly two hundred members have connected themselves with the association. The sole purpose of the group is to promote international arbitration. It is to give special attention to the subject of arbitration treaties between France and other nations, and to inducing the governments to make early and general use of the tribunal at The Hague, which they created. The group will also cooperate with any similar organizations which may be formed in other national legislatures.

One of the most hopeful occurrences of the year was the conclusion of the arbitration convention between Chile and the Argentine Republic, supplemented by a treaty of real though limited disarmament, as our Chairman has so interestingly stated.

Interesting as all these events of the past year are in themselves, their force and significance cannot properly be understood without keeping in mind the long series of influences in the past which have led up to them and made them possible. One must recall the famous Rescript of the Czar of Russia; the great popular crusade in Western Europe and America which followed it; the work of special conferences and bar associations; the magnificent service of the hundred men who gathered at The Hague and labored for ten weeks with great intelligence, practical wisdom and harmony in drafting the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes; the action of the twenty-one governments in ratifying the Convention and their wisdom in selecting capable men to represent them in the Court.

In order to appreciate the fruitfulness of the past year one must recall also the long list of arbitrations during the past century, some two hundred in number, in which nearly every conceivable kind of dispute was successfully adjusted by special arbitrations. One must

bear in mind, too, that nearly all the powers of the world have taken part in larger or smaller measure in this application of arbitration to the settlement of their controversies. Nor must it be forgotten that the national legislatures of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and other countries have time and time again in strong resolutions sanctioned the principle which is now embodied in the Hague Tribunal. One must take into account likewise the work of the Interparliamentary Union, whose members in all the European legislatures have for more than a dozen years labored effectively for a general system of arbitration; and that of the International Law Association, which for thirty years has made arbitration, and in more recent years a permanent international tribunal, a leading feature of its program.

In estimating the proper significance of the events of the year which have been enumerated above, one must also not ignore the labors of the peace congresses, and of the early peace societies in the days when arbitration had no friends and supporters in the governments and but few in private life. Noah Worcester, William E. Channing, William Ladd, Charles Sumner, William Jay, Elihu Burritt and men of like intelligence and force in other countries, who pleaded for arbitration and a permanent court before modern arbitration conferences and bar association plans were thought of, must not be forgotten in the enumeration. One might indeed go much further back and recall the heroic efforts of the distinguished men of the past three centuries, Hugo Grotius, William Penn, St. Pierre, Kant, Bentham, and others who pleaded for this Christian method in the days when war with its almost unmitigated horrors and crimes raged everywhere.

It is a far cry from those days to these. The events of the past year over which we at Mohonk are to-day rejoicing are much more the fruits of the labors of these men of the near and the far past than they are of those of us who have only for the past decade or less been doing work—timely and most valuable—towards promoting the great movement in whose interests we are gathered here. We have entered into the labors of all these men of the past, and the only way in which we can prove ourselves their worthy successors is faithfully to put forth every effort in our power to finish the structure approaching its completion so rapidly. There seems little doubt as we gather here for this Ninth Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conference that the end of our hopes will be measurably realized in a few years more, if we and other individuals and organizations similar to this give ourselves earnestly, steadfastly and wisely to the completion of the work so well begun and now so far advanced.

The President then introduced the Rev. Dr. Everett D. Burr, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Newton Centre, Mass.

THE HUMAN CONDITIONS WHICH MAKE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION INEVITABLE.

ADDRESS OF EVERETT D. BURR, D. D.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: At a meeting held recently in Boston in commemoration of the centenary of the birth of Ralph Waldo Emerson, his son, Dr. Edward W. Emerson, gave a pleasant picture of the Concord home when Thoreau came in to play with the children about the hearth. There was a young man conferring with Mr. Emerson as to whether or not he had better give his time the next few years to a college education. Dr. Emerson said that his father had the conviction that there might be many ways to heaven, but he was quite sure that one of them went by Harvard College, and so he advised the young man to go to Harvard, saying pleasantly, "I feel sure that they teach most of the branches there." Whereupon Thoreau interposed the remark: "Yes; all the branches, but none of the roots!"

Leaving out Mr. Thoreau's sarcasm, I should like to use his figure and remind the Conference that in the report of Dr. Trueblood we have seen the growth of the cause of arbitration. Here it stands beautiful, umbrageous, ramified, until it includes within its reach thirty-seven great nations. It is well for us in looking at its widely ramified growth to remind ourselves that there are some deep roots out of which this growth and larger life matures. Therefore, in following up what Dr. Trueblood has said, it seemed to me that while I could not speak technically I might take your hearts with me into a moment's reflection as to what are at least these deeply human conditions which make international arbitration inevitable in the near future. For our hopefulness I venture to suggest some of these.

First of all, we are living, I think, in a time which might be characterized as a time of *contemporaneous humanity*. There are no more any foreign lands; we have a closer feeling toward remote communities than our forefathers had toward their fellow-men who lived in the next town. We are in the midst of conditions that remind us that there are no distant peoples. That which goes on in the courts of kings and that which is decided in the legislatures of republics comes to us with the morning news. The seas which used to separate nation from nation are now bridged by the fast-going ships, and they are tunneled by the cables. There was a time when nations conceived of themselves as parts of an archipelago, thinking that they were only remotely, if at all, related to each other, but it has been discovered in these later times that there is no such thing as isolation, that underneath the fluent seas there are the great ribs of a continent that make the peoples one. These nerve lines of cable communication are not dull, insensate threads, but they are the very nerves of the intercommunication and the interpenetration of life, so that the

heart-beat of one nation echoes in the bosom of every other nation in the world.

Then out of this contemporaneousness of humanity has grown what we might term *a community of interests*. The conception of humanity as an organism in which part ministers to part and the sufficiency of some supplies the lack of others is pressed home upon us with every week's experience. The wheat crop of Australia affects the Dakota farmers. The Board of Trade in the city of Chicago is affected by business conditions in Calcutta, and Boston finds it convenient to get in touch with Bombay. This community of interests has been the more emphasized by the *increase of distant travel*. As one friend has said, "There are multitudes who are seeking the world over for perpetual spring." This very quest of the beauties of climate and interesting scenery, with its wider study of humanity, has brought about the wide interpenetration of the life of one nation with the life of another, so that the hitherto prevalent attitude of suspicion has been gradually removed; it has melted like an ice floe in the summer sea. Mutual acquaintance is unifying the nations.

Another element of the present condition which is so widely human is the *prevalent charity among the nations*. "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." Whether it be a disaster at Martinique in St. Pierre, or the famine in India, or the recent atrocious massacre at Kishineff, there is the awakening of the heart-beat of human sympathy in every nation of the world. So that we realize that we have made large advances in the passing centuries. There was a time when men said, "Live! that is our business; live, at any cost to others." With a wider tolerance the motto of the nations became: "Live, and let live." But it has been found that there is something better than tolerance, and that is the spirit of service, so that the spirit prevailing among the nations now is, "Live, and help live." [Applause.] We have found in our social communities that we cannot stand ankle deep in ice water and escape congestion of the lungs. We have found in our cities that if the North End or the South End is diseased, the best residential districts pay tribute. By the laws of human brotherhood, if a community is elevated, the whole community must go up together.

We find this same truth in our wider nationalism. Instead of men being sectionalists to-day, we have some noble specimens of statesmanship in our halls of legislature who are brave enough and American enough to say that they have no opinions upon a certain issue as Southerners or as Northerners, but as Americans they have something that they are called upon to say.

These lessons of a larger brotherhood, so well learned in smaller interests, compel the application of the same spirit in issue, which shall take into their purview the whole race, and compel the nations to realize that whatever makes for the uplifting of one people makes for the uplifting of the race. And so the nations of the world in this wider ministry of brotherly love will go up together.

Then, too, there is an interrelation of nation with nation along *educational lines*. It is interesting to realize that the newest of our American Universities has among its faculty some of the most noted men of other lands. Recently Professor Münsterberg, of Harvard, a German, interpreted the New England Seer, Emerson, to the students of the new century. Dr. Lorenz, of Vienna, sets the hip of a Chicago child, and heals the children in many American cities on his way. The Rhodes' Scholarship Fund is particularly significant from the educational point of view. There is a mingling of thought with thought, as the students of one nation meet and mingle with the students of other nations, so that we are coming to know ourselves as members of one great family and children of one loving Father.

How irrelevant, therefore, in such human conditions appears war! These tendencies, these great root forces that are underground and out of sight, are nevertheless producing such growths that war and conflict and bloodshed are made not only irrelevant but impertinent, not only impertinent but incongruous, not only incongruous but impossible!

Together with these wide commercial and sympathetic interests, there has been a growth of what we might call the *race conscience*, so that any nation that seeks or considers for a moment entering into a dispute feels compelled to justify itself before the conscience of the nations. Time was when nations thought more of their rights than now; now they are thinking of mutual duties. They have come to a finer ethical maturity which manifests itself not in self-assertion or in self-adjustment, but in that larger, finer expression of moral life — self-sacrifice.

As we conceive of this maturity of the race life, are we not reminded that the great movement toward international arbitration in the last hundred years is fulfilling in its ramified and beauteous growth the suggestion of the impulse of these great imbedded human roots? Conceive of it for a moment. A hundred years ago there were practically no issues of great significance submitted to arbitration, whereas in the first and second decades of the last century there were two or three, in the third decade about five, and so rapidly increasing in number until in the last decade of the last century fully sixty questions of great significance were submitted to arbitration, and in the hundred years fully two hundred such questions were submitted to arbitration.

In the long perspective, do we not see that there has been a splendid progress, a progress toward a maturity of race life? How we love to see this maturity in the individual! We like the fervor of the undergraduate at college, with his yells and his enthusiasm, when he flings his banners and waves his colors in the air. He thinks there is no other institution in the world but his alma mater under whose splendid classic shades he has been working for a while. But that man finds his maturity in putting away the childish things of the college undergraduate days, and becoming interested in the wider

cause of education. So it is in a man's religious experience; he may begin as an ardent sectarian, but afterwards, when he conceives of a universal God, he becomes interested in the kingdom of God and says little about sectarianism. He considers a form of service more important than a form of statement. His creed is in his deed.

It is toward this larger maturity that we are forging ahead. The nations feel their place in the world for the perfecting of the race. We feel the impulse of these past ages; we have entered into the labors of others; we feel their spirit; we are endowed with their heritage and enriched with the investiture of their mantle. Let us go on to larger conquests.

When General U. S. Grant stood viewing the British troops, he said, "They march with the swing of centuries of conquest." There was something in the rhythmic beat of those triumphant feet that made him think of the centuries of British supremacy. So it seems to me there is quivering in the atmosphere about us as we look back over these one hundred years of conquest in this great cause, a clarion note which summons us to "Advance!"

"God bade the sun with golden steps sublime, advance!
 He whispered in the listening ear of Time, advance!
 He bade the guiding spirit of the stars
 With lightning speed in silver shining cars
 Along the bright floors of his azure halls, advance!
 Sun, time and stars obey his voice, and all advance.
 Knowledge came down and waved her steady torch, advance!
 Sages proclaimed in many a marble porch, advance!
 As winged lightning leaps from peak to peak,
 The Gaul, the Goth, the Roman and the Greek,
 The painted Briton caught the winged word, and all advance.
 Earth grew young and caroled like a bird, advance!"

My good friends, and friends of international arbitration, may we not catch the rhythmic beat of the century of splendid conquest, and move on to a nobler advance!

The President next introduced Rev. Dr. Philip S. Moxom, of Springfield, Mass.

SIGNIFICANT SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

ADDRESS OF REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM, D.D.

I was approached at a late hour last night by the Secretary of the Conference, who in his usual bland and compelling way told me that the committee had appointed me to follow Dr. Trueblood this morning with a ten minutes' speech. Now, then, I am expected to speak for ten minutes on this tremendous subject, after being frightened out of my wits by the Secretary, and somewhat perplexed, if not angered, by the remarks about preachers, and dazed and exalted by the eloquent speech which we have just heard.

Fox, I think it was, said that one fact is worth a thousand arguments. That came to my mind this morning as I listened to the address by our President and by Dr. Trueblood. We are getting the solidest kind of argument in the shape of facts. These facts are extremely interesting. They show a very important change in the attitude of other peoples toward the whole question of arbitration. There has been a certain reluctance on the part of nations who had representatives at the Hague Conference to accept the result of their own work. I think that some of them were rather playing at arbitration in the Hague Conference, and when they found that the Conference was to be taken seriously they were rather troubled. But the moral impulse had been gained, a certain fact had been established, certain precedents were already before the eyes and the mind of the world, and, though reluctantly, they at last yielded. Now the movement has begun that will culminate soon in the universal recognition of the Hague Court as the proper tribunal to which to refer cases of international difference, and to which practically every case will be referred. That is very significant.

I confess to a little amusement and entertainment as I think of the attitude of some of these powers. The Venezuelan case is perhaps the most interesting. The allied powers and Venezuela appearing before the Court at The Hague recalls to my mind a cartoon which I saw, perhaps in *Life*, perhaps in *Judge*, I do not remember exactly where. A woman had brought her husband to the police court on a charge of assaulting her and giving her a black eye. The woman weighed two hundred pounds and had a good deal of muscle; her husband was a poor little fellow with one arm in a sling, one leg tied up, leaning on a crutch, and with one eye bandaged. The judge looked with surprise at the little man and the big woman, and said, "How could your husband in this condition give you a black eye?" And the woman replied, "He weren't in that condition, your honor, when he guv me the black eye!" The allied powers before the Hague Tribunal confronting poor little Venezuela makes me think of that.

But to pass on to the facts; we can meditate upon them as we will. By desperately frantic efforts I have managed to get together two or three ideas that seem to me to have some value. You may not agree with me when I have finished. Besides the facts, there are signs. Sometimes these are more significant than facts, because they are the premonitions of larger facts that are looming on the horizon and that are to be realized in the actual experience of peoples.

May I cite as the first sign — I am scarcely consistent in my use of language, but it is to me very significant, and what is a sign but a thing that is significant? — the steady, constant, consistent attitude on this general subject of our own government.

I have had the affliction of hearing a certain class of Americans continually abusing their own government and their own institutions. They get a certain voice through the press, and they get a certain

voice through the means of oral communication. I would like to say here that during the past year I have been reviewing, by the help of our honored President, the diplomatic history of the United States for the last hundred years, and I cannot find in this world any parallel to that diplomacy for dignity and honesty and generosity and truth. All honor to the American name! One of the best signs of the time is the high sense of honor, the clear vision, the steadfast adherence to principle, and the persistent adherence to the principle of rational peace illustrated by our government to-day. You may consider it in its relations to Venezuela or to China, or in any other of its foreign relations, and it stands as one of the most powerful influences in the world for the promotion of the very end we are seeking. This is one of the most hopeful signs on the horizon to-day.

Then there is another sign which is even more distinct, and that is the recent demand among the people for the application of the principle of arbitration between bodies of men who are separated by industrial or commercial interests. Now this is all one with the principle of international arbitration. During the past year we have had in the coal strike an experience that has brought this very vividly to mind, and the people are coming to a consciousness of the value of arbitration as the true method of settling difficulties. Just in proportion as that gets its grip upon the people, in that proportion will the whole cause of arbitration and its effectiveness as a means of settling difficulties advance. That cause has received a great impulse forward from the internal experience which we have just had as a nation.

Another sign is the growing protest against materialism and the rising into fresh power of spiritual values in the deepest and best sense. Allusion has been made by Dr. Burr to the celebration of the Emerson centenary. The same matter was in my own mind as I contemplated the outlook. It was a wonderful thing. Thirty years ago, when I was a student in the Theological Seminary, Emerson was one of the bugaboos which were used to scare theological babies and put them to sleep. I was told that Emerson was an infidel, that he was a pagan, that he was dangerous, and to beware of him. I got hold of a volume of Emerson in the winter of 1870-71. I had never seen anything of his before, and as I read it I felt as if something had exploded in my brain; and, to use Emerson's own phraseology in another connection, I waked up with an appetite that could eat the solar system like a cake. I proceeded to eat and I have been eating ever since.

Last Sunday all over this land Christian churches, orthodox and heterodox,—if there be any such distinction to-day, which we begin to doubt,—celebrated that quiet, simple, sincere man of Concord in their churches, made it part of their worship of Almighty God. It is a very wonderful thing. What does it mean? That the whole emphasis of Emerson's life and his message was in the interest of loyalty and spirituality, the preëminence of spiritual values

and the superior power of spiritual forces. This, emerging in the thought and the feeling of the people to-day, is informing their judgment on all questions of social relations and international relations. And the spirit of materialism which makes the grasping of money or material riches the great end of life is beginning at last to yield—in the thought, at least, of the people—to the higher appreciation of values that is involved in a spiritual view of life.

That to me is the most significant and hopeful sign of the times. Man cannot live by bread alone. We cannot live on stocks and mines and factories and railways. While all these are vast and powerful instruments of our civilization, the moment they become ends, that moment they bring poison and trouble. The moment we see that they are only instruments, that moment our civilization is safe; and that moment every cause like this of arbitration moves on with great haste, and the brute forces of life pass away.

I want to say one word more, and this is in answer to the question, What can we do? We must steadily promote the spirit of reasonableness and of obedience to law in our own communities in order to further the cause of the triumph of reasonableness and obedience to law in international relations.

There is no single fact of our national life that presses upon our hearts with heavier weight, or that brings greater pain, than the disposition of certain communities in our country to disregard the processes of law and to revert back to the savage method of settling difficulties by the exercise of personal force. This is significant, because so long as that spirit prevails, and so far as it prevails, so much greater will be the difficulty of getting the spirit of reasonableness and obedience to law effectively influential in international relations. There is one work which we can do that will serve our cause immediately, constantly and powerfully.

When communities of people, north or south, east or west, violate their own institutions and the natural processes of justice by doing things that must leave a stain and a perpetual scar on the social organization, they exert a very hurtful influence and raise a huge obstruction in the way of our achieving the end for which we are working here; for you cannot have reasonableness and obedience to law between nations if you do not have these dominant in communities. It is part and parcel of our whole work, and on this truth we must put emphasis for the sake of the larger end which we have continually in view—that nations, instead of bringing out their armies to fight, shall sit down together and settle their difficulties. In order to help on this great end, communities must let the processes of law have their due course.

THE PRESIDENT: We are all prouder of our country for what we have achieved in peace than for what we have achieved by war, and patriotism is not necessarily associated with war or with fighting. The man who has taught us best and taught us most what patriotism is, and what a country we have to be proud of, and the reasons for our pride, is to speak to us now, Dr. Edward Everett Hale.

THE SUCCESS OF THE SECOND PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS

ADDRESS OF REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D. D.

I have been permitted by the Committee to say something on the subject which has interested me, I believe, more than any other in the last year, which seems to me to have been unduly passed by, and that is, the success of the second Pan-American Congress in Mexico. I am not going to say it with any attitude of American boasting, but our own delegates to that Congress were statesmen up to the very noblest point of statesmanship. They knew how to hold their tongues. They were instructed not to make a fuss, and they didn't make it. And among ourselves it is well to say, I think, that they had absolutely their own way because they said so little.

Now that second Conference was exactly in the line of the noble diplomatic move of Americans for the last thirty years. Mr. Blaine's first Pan-American Congress for many reasons was not received with the distinction that it deserved. The second Pan-American Congress, which has done a very great work, is scarcely remarked by our writers; but I do think that here we ought to bear in mind the duties which the second Pan-American Congress has brought upon us. Therefore it was that I asked the privilege of speaking for ten minutes about it.

In the first place, they came together, and "together" is a very great word. If the Hague Conference had parted without making the three great conventions which it did make, the mere fact that a hundred of the noblest and wisest men in the world had sat in the same room for nearly a hundred days would have been a great step forward. Now here nineteen nations sat together in the City of Mexico. I do not understand why Canada could not have been represented, though perhaps Mr. Chamberlain or Lord Salisbury does. But there are many things about the British government which we do not understand, thank God!

There came the Latin-American nations, as we like to say. The delegates came with chips on their shoulders, and they were perfectly determined that the chips should be knocked off, so that they might take offense and withdraw. Mr. Hay simply said to our five gentlemen, "Take back seats and hold your tongues." Well, now, they were men who could talk well. If Dr. Moxom will permit me to say so, they could talk better than ministers; but they were also men with this sublime gift, that they could keep their tongues between their teeth and could keep still, and they did. The result was, that the Pan-American Congress achieved great results, and it committed the nineteen nations of America, those who had been represented at The Hague and those who had not, to the conclusions of the Hague Conference. So that now we can come here and say that more than forty of the greatest nations of the world are in the

Hague Tribunal (for they will be in it in a short time), whereas before we could only say there were twenty-six nations represented there. That alone, if nothing else had happened, would have been a very noble laurel for the Pan-American Congress.

But I think it went forward, and went forward in the great step of simplifying government, by enabling the parliaments of the world to act on matters which have been well threshed out, well discussed, and not be obliged to approach them as individuals. In our own Legislature in Massachusetts there come together some two hundred and eighty men who have to study up a variety of subjects, and they do it extremely well, and at the end of six months they retire with certain results. But how much better they could do it if before they met a body of experts should report on what is and what is not the fact about those matters! There isn't another so good an illustration in the world as here, where for twenty years there has been a Conference about Indian affairs. They meet in this very hall once a year, and they draw up a statement of the things that ought to be done and that ought not to be done about Indians. And that statement — the press lets it alone if it chooses — but that statement goes to Congress, and when the Indian committees of Congress meet they have in one hundred and fifty words a statement of what the experts report should be done about the Indians. And anybody who follows up the legislation of the last five years will find that that determination of the experts as to what is desirable has had a very large effect upon the legislation of Congress about Indians. You have seen the very same thing when the doctors have got together and determined what ought and what ought not to be done about quarantine, for these doctors know more about quarantine than chief justices or business men.

Now the Pan-American Congress had certain things which it thought important to be done. One of those things was this very regulation of quarantine between the nineteen nations. It proposed that the different governments should appoint commissions or committees on quarantine, and that those committees should meet in the City of New York in the year 1902, and should then determine and put on paper what would be good regulations for quarantine.

It proposed, in the second place, in regard to the mere machinery of custom houses, that the nineteen nations should appoint delegates who should meet in New York and determine what would be good rules about shipping and invoices, and about the methods of keeping customs' accounts, etc.

They proposed, thirdly, because the coffee industry of the world was in a very bad way, that every coffee raising nation and every important nation should appoint a committee to meet in New York and report what would be good legislation and what would not be good legislation on coffee.

I never have seen in any of the journals of the country any report of the meeting of either of these three committees on the subjects of quarantine, customs and coffee. But none the less those committees

all met and made their reports, and those reports are now in the hands of every government of the nineteen. They are in the hands of our government, they are in the hands of the governments to the south of us, and they are the material for the legislation of this new year.

Now I am talking to two hundred and fifty sensible men and women, and I like to say to them that I think this business of inaugurating government by experts is a thing of the very first importance, and I can't help wishing that this Conference here may signify to the Congress of the United States its impression that it would be as well to follow up the decisions of these expert committees by the proper legislation. It is precisely there that we come to one of the largest duties which we can perform.

Charles Sumner said to me years and years ago, speaking of treaties when they were brought to the Senate of the United States—I rather think that President Foster knows something about that—he said that treaties were like foundling children left on the steps of the Senate Chamber, that nobody cared anything about a treaty when it got to Congress.

Wouldn't it be a good thing if we could press the Congress of the United States just to take up these three babies that are lying on its doorsteps now, and do something about them! And would it not be a good thing if the pressure of this body should be brought to bear on the House of Representatives and on the Senate of the United States, to say, "When you have come to the edge of the river and have built the bridge, would it not be as well to cross the river?"

The last thing I want to speak of is the Great Pan-American Railway. Mr. Blaine, in the great foresight which called together the Pan-American Congress, put Andrew Carnegie at the head of the committee for an international railway between the Arctic and the Antarctic Circles. Mr. Carnegie at that time expressed the interest which he has never lost in this railway. They appointed a commission to survey the route for this railway. This commission divided its work among eight engineering bodies. It took ten years in making the surveys, and completed them, I think, in the year 1895. Fortunately for the world, at the head of those engineering commissions was the head of the Pennsylvania Railroad to-day, Mr. Alexander J. Cassatt.

When I speak of the subject everybody laughs. When I say that Mr. Bates, the great English botanist, after residing eight years in the valley of the Amazon, said, "Although humanity can reach an advanced state of culture only by battling with the inclemencies of nature,—high latitudes,—it is under the equator alone that the perfect race of the future will attain to complete fruition of man's beautiful heritage, the earth," everybody laughs at him. They say that it is a place for monkeys and butterflies, but not for men.

But before I sit down I would like to remind you of what Robert Livingstone said one hundred years ago to-day in writing a letter to

President Jefferson. He said: "I have told them all that we shall not send an emigrant across the Mississippi in the next hundred years." If any one had foretold then the great population which the next hundred years would see in the valley of the Mississippi he would have been called a crank. And that is what you will say of me when I tell you that the completion of the railway between the North and the South of the American continents, and the populating of the valley of the Amazon, and making the people of North America acquainted with the people of South America, will be the result of the work of the next hundred years. [Applause.]

Dr. Hale offered the following resolution, which was referred to the Business Committee:

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be requested to call the attention of every member of Congress, and of both Committees on Foreign Relations, to the special requests of the Mexican Pan-American Congress regarding the International Railway of North and South America, and of the committees appointed by the Pan-American Congress which have recently met in the city of New York.

The Treasurer, Mr. Alexander C. Wood, presented his report, which was approved and placed on file, and the Conference adjourned until 8 P. M.

Second Session.

Wednesday Evening, May 27, 1903.

The Conference was called to order at 8 o'clock by the President, who announced the topic for the evening: "Methods of Influencing Public Opinion."

The following gentlemen made addresses: Hon. Henry B. F. Macfarland, President of the Commission of the District of Columbia; President W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University; Edwin D. Mead, Esq., of Boston; Mr. St. Clair McKelway, editor *Brooklyn Eagle*; Mr. A. Maurice Low, Washington Correspondent of the London *Daily News*, Boston *Globe*, etc., and Mr. Bliss Perry of Boston, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

Henry B. F. Macfarland, President of the Municipal Government of the City of Washington, was introduced as the first speaker.

THE POWER OF THE PRESS IN MAKING PUBLIC OPINION IN FAVOR OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND.

I appreciate very much indeed the honor of being allowed to stand in your presence to introduce this subject. I understand, of course, that it is because of my representative capacity in part, and also because it is desired, from time to time, to have a new voice to say the old things; or perhaps you wanted, for the time being, a new hand at the bellows to blow up the flame. You have to have in connection with every such great movement as this what they call in the expositions a Department of Promotion and Publicity. The rule of success for an exposition, provided you have anything whatever to exhibit, is "publicity! publicity! publicity!" and that is the rule of success, of course, for this movement. You have something to exhibit, and it is necessary that the attention of intelligent men and women shall be drawn to it. However well we who are here to-night, and those of you who have been assembling here for all these years, may know what we are doing, the great Republic, the eighty millions in this country, to say nothing of the millions across the seas under the American flag, may know very little about it.

I read this afternoon for the first time all the reports of all the Mohonk Arbitration Conferences. I am almost ashamed to say that I

never had seen them before, but I had not, and I know that my experience is that of millions of others. I have been interested in this Conference in a general way. I have read what I saw about it in the weekly publications, and what little I saw about it in the daily press, but I never saw the official reports until to-day. And that suggests to my mind that it is time that the Conference was better known, and that we must see that it is.

In looking over those reports to-day I saw that everything had been already said, so that all I can do to-night in introducing the subject of "Methods of Influencing Public Opinion in Favor of International Arbitration" is to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance of what has been said.

I suppose one reason why I was asked to speak on this topic is that I live in the only place — in the United States, at least — where public opinion governs directly; where, because we have no suffrage, and therefore no partisan politics, and no "machine," and no "boss," and no corruption, we can and do have direct application of public opinion to public affairs, and direct government by public opinion. Of course, public opinion governs indirectly everywhere, even in Russia, but in the District of Columbia it governs directly.

One other reason why I am asked to speak, I suppose, is because for twenty years or more I have been familiar, as a Washington correspondent, with the common methods of influencing public opinion and bringing it to bear on governments. I have seen the great movements desiring legislation — as, for example, in respect to the tariff, international copyright, and so on — come first with their messages, come first with their pressure from the outside, and then come perhaps personally and carry by storm, in some cases, the Congress. Therefore I suppose that it was expected that I might be able to say something which would be of a practical character in regard to this matter.

I want to make one or two general observations first. One thing is that we are dealing, of course, with men and women whenever we seek to influence public opinion. You take the Congress of the United States, to which reference is made in derogatory terms from time to time. The senators and representatives are men like the rest of us, just as good and patriotic and interested in good causes, and the percentage of virtue among them is just as high as among a similar number of business or professional men. And that, I think, applies to all the people everywhere. It is a thing to be kept in mind. In other words, we have a hopeful task if we have a good cause, and the chief thing necessary for its success is to bring it before the people. At the same time, we must remember that other fellow citizens are not only as good as we are, but they are also as bad as we are, and that they are influenced in the wrong way by the same considerations that influence us. Revenge, interest, passion in any form, has its effect upon their minds as upon ours; perhaps more so than upon some of us here, because this is a selected company, selected by one who knows how to select.

We must keep in mind, also, that while here, on what one of the former speakers has called the Delectable Mountains, we can look out towards a Beulah land beyond the valleys, beyond the plains of ordinary life, which the people who do not come here cannot see; and that while it is well for us to see visions, while "where there is no vision the people perish," while we must see for those who cannot see for themselves, perhaps we must also keep in mind their limitations and their difficulties and their discouragements, and not be discouraged ourselves if they do not take at once the highest ideals that we have to offer. I think we must have the highest ideals, but we must also have the idea or the plan. I notice in these addresses that it is asked over and over again, "What next?" And that means always some direct step, and that, it seems to me, is exceedingly desirable.

And here let me say that the sweet reasonableness of all that has been said and done here struck me as it might not strike you, perhaps, unless you had come to it freshly as I did; unless you had read for the first time, and all at once, all that has been said at these Conferences.

The principle of international arbitration has won its case in the forum of public opinion, the supreme court of the modern world. In a remarkably short time, simply by the force of its reason, it has secured that verdict. But like other principles flowing from the teaching of Christ, principles which have commanded universal approval, its application to particular cases does not follow as a matter of course. Human nature, which does not take kindly to such counsels of perfection, whether in the life of the individual or in that of a nation, interferes with the application of this principle. Until the Prince of Peace shall exercise full authority, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven, neither nations nor individuals will prefer always the peacemakers to the warmakers.

International arbitration of all questions of difference is not regarded as practicable at this time by any one who knows the force of national pride, passion and prejudice. In almost every instance of international quarrels it is difficult to bring the quarreling nations to the Court of Arbitration, and it is frankly admitted that there are questions (as, for example, the Monroe Doctrine) which would not be submitted to arbitration even by the nations which have advocated and practised its principles most zealously. Armies and navies are still necessary.

And to digress just a moment: as one who has lived all his life in Washington, who has known more or less well many of the officers of the army and navy, I want to thank those who in former years have spoken well here of those men when they were criticised. I believe that everything that has been said here in defense and in praise of the men of our army and of our navy is just and true, and we should keep that in mind constantly. I want to say also that from an acquaintance with many of those men, and I have intimate friends in both the army and navy, I believe that there are

no men anywhere more desirous for the settlement of controversies between nations by arbitration than the officers of the army and navy. And this is conspicuously true of the men who have leadership in either the army or the navy. They all look upon the army and the navy as a means of keeping the peace, and I never heard one of them suggest that his personal interest called him or induced him or influenced him to want war under any circumstances.

Nations, we must remember, too, are proverbially more selfish than any of their citizens. And after all we must remember — and this seems to me very important, especially in these comparisons between the Supreme Court of the United States and the Hague Tribunal — that the nations are very different from the individual states of our Union, different in responsibility as well as in character. Civilized men have given up the settlement of differences by personal warfare. That is not true, though, of all American citizens. We know what goes on in the mountain districts of the South, and we know what goes on from time to time in the North. Mr. Proctor, of Kentucky, told me the other day of a man in that State who complained that he was not allowed “to fight in peace.” He also told me of being not very long ago in the mountain district of Kentucky at the house of the surviving member of one of the clans — all the rest of that clan and all the other clan having been exterminated. He knew him very well, and said to him: “Mr. Smith, what was it I read awhile ago about your feud with the other family? What was the outcome of it?” “Well,” he said, “I’m here and they ain’t!” That still goes on in our own country; it is only civilized people who have given up the settlement of differences by warfare.

The two great warring economic forces, capital and labor, are advancing to that position. But the most civilized nations cannot bind themselves to submit every question to international arbitration. It is therefore needful that those who believe most thoroughly in the principles of international arbitration should labor for an extension of their application to the maximum number of possible cases. It is of course to public opinion, and chiefly to the public opinion of intelligent and educated men and women in the great nations which now rule the world, that we must look for the extension of the employment of arbitration.

The press, never so powerful, never so admirable on the whole as now, is unquestionably more and more a maker as well as an organ of public opinion, and it is now largely in favor of international arbitration. The press must be more fully enlisted. I know that a great deal has been done in that direction, but I would like to see the Associated Press directly interested through its managers in this movement, so that it would see to its having the publicity that it ought to have. And then, of course, the editors and conductors of weekly journals, all of whom want just the best that we want, want to help. The arrangements can be made, as they have been made for other causes, so that their conferences shall have full attention. People speak very lightly of the press and its power, but it

must be reckoned with as a mighty force, and it ought to be taken seriously. Everybody who comes directly in contact with the best of the press must know that it is willing to advance this cause, as it has already done, I think, in large measure in the past.

It is equally important, of course, that all the other agencies for instructing and inspiring the public mind, and notably all religious organizations, should be brought into touch with this movement. Through them we get at the young, and there is the hope of the future. Through them also you get at the home, and if the fathers and mothers will talk international arbitration to the boys and girls of the home, the question will be settled.

Of course, the formal educational institutions, public and private, already so deeply interested in many cases, which help to shape the thought of to-morrow even more than that of to-day, must always be depended upon to do much of what is to be done.

Then, too, the great commercial organizations of the country, which have done already so much in this cause, at least those in the Eastern States, can do and will do even more in the future. I was deeply interested in what Mr. Woodruff told me of Mr. Kline's ordering a special edition of the report of last year's Conference and circulating it among his friends in Philadelphia.

Every kind of advertising — proper and dignified advertising — ought to be availed of in this cause. Somebody suggested in a previous session of this Conference that street cars should be used. It would certainly be a great opportunity to reach thousands of people who would never read the Conference report, or would perhaps never see the weekly journals or the paragraphs relating to this matter in the daily journals.

While we must look for leadership and inspiration to such men and women as gather here, to the men in the pulpit and in the editorial chair, to the men in the colleges, this will never be what it ought to be until it becomes a popular movement. The whole mass of the people must be brought into sympathy with it.

Among all the means of rightly influencing the opinion of this country on this question a foremost place must be given to the Mohonk Conferences, which command attention and remind us impressively and with authority of the arguments for the more general application of international arbitration and the progress made from year to year. There is no doubt that much good has been done by other conferences, by the New York Bar Association, by the work of the National Bar Association, by the work of Chambers of Commerce and other organizations, but I do not know of any one Conference which has the position and the influence and the power which this Mohonk Conference has. The influence of these meetings at Mohonk is felt not only directly, through formal action taken, but even more powerfully, though indirectly, through the consideration afterwards by thoughtful men and women at home and abroad of what is said here. Much of the progress gained is due to these Conferences, which have furnished leadership and inspiration. It

would be well if the cream of what has been said here should be gathered in a small volume written in the lucid and attractive style of the President of this Conference, which would serve at once as a tract for the propaganda and a text-book for institutions of learning.

THE CHAIRMAN: This great cause has received probably as hearty and efficient support from the great educational institutions of the country as from any other quarter. College presidents and professors have been in this room frequently, and have freely expressed their opinion upon this subject. It is in the universities and colleges that is now being formed the opinion which is to control this country, on this and on almost all other questions. It is very appropriate, therefore, that we should have a representative of this great and powerful controlling influence in the country to continue this discussion of how public opinion is to be reached and controlled. We have now to address us a worthy representative of the universities and colleges in the person of President Faunce of the venerable Brown University.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT W. H. P. FAUNCE.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Horace Mann uttered a truth with which we are all familiar, but which we often forget, when he said: "Whatever you wish to have appear in the life of a nation you must first introduce into its schools." Every reform begins as a feeling, as an instinctive and unreasoned revolt; then it becomes an idea; then it passes into an education. No reform achieves anything until it passes beyond the hortatory stage, beyond the dream stage, and settles down to the serious, slow, plodding, irresistible work of education. Teach in the schools that society is a social contract, and that solely, and a little later you will have in the streets a French Revolution. Teach in the schools the doctrine of *laissez faire*, and you will soon have employers who steel their hearts against their fellowmen. Teach in the schools the essential brotherhood of all men, and you are doing much to pave the way for the federation of all civilized nations.

Moreover, whatever may be true of the old world, it is true in America that a large part of the moral energy of our generation is pulsating through the American college. Some of us have been willing to leave the active pastorate in the hope of getting more deeply into the ministry. Once the Church monopolized the moral energy of the community; the man who wished to do good to his fellows must do it through the avenues of the Church. Happily now for the Church itself, it is no longer the only avenue of moral

energy. When I look down on the average Sunday morning congregation I am oppressed by the perception of how large a percentage of the average Sunday gathering — complacent, conventional and respectable — is not likely to be seriously changed by anything that the preacher may do or say. By reason of mis-education, by reason of the warping influence of unhappy experience, by reason of the fixity that comes with years, by reason of fossilization of mind, a very large percentage will not be changed by anything that the Sunday service may offer. But you never can feel that way as you look down upon an audience of college men. As I look down upon four or five hundred such every morning, I feel as if I were looking on a company of locomotives, standing on the track with the steam up. No trouble about getting them to go! The only difficulty is to get them moving on the right rails. A large part of the energy of our time is pulsating through the American college, and for this reason it is a supremely important matter how our colleges are thinking regarding international arbitration. Therefore I welcome here — if I may stand beside our host for a moment — so many college graduates, college professors and executives. Let us carry home from this Conference something of stimulus which we may give to the young men and women of this country, stirring them to work for the great and noble cause in whose name we are assembled.

Now what can the colleges do, and what are they doing? You will be surprised if I say anything about college athletics. Those of us who read the newspapers — and we all do, those of us who believe in the veracity of reporters — and some of us do, are aware that according to popular opinion the most important department in the well-conducted college of to-day is that of athletics. But in athletics our students are committed to the principle that whenever in intercollegiate contests there arises any dispute whatever, it shall be referred to impartial expert opinion. Boys trained to believe *that*, for four years in a secondary school and for four years more in college, are getting hold of a principle that will bear wider application yet. In all their athletic sports our young men are made to learn not only chivalry toward a defeated foe, not only loyalty to a defeated friend, but they are made to believe in the futility and brutality of violence; they are made to recognize that a dispute is to be referred always to brain, and never to brawn; that it is expert opinion that counts when two colleges fall out in a legitimate contest, and that they must submit instantly when the referee has pronounced his decision. If the Duke of Wellington believed that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playground at Eton, may we not believe that our college athletic fields are the rehearsals for Geneva Conferences and Hague Tribunals and Pan-American Congresses, and in their small measure are doing a little something to bring about the parliament of man, the federation of the world! [Applause].

But there is another thing our colleges are doing — they are showing us the service of science in preparing a mechanism of international public opinion. I venture to say that public opinion in the

international or even the national sense is a modern thing. Public opinion as a force, in the sense in which we now have it and can wield it, is something essentially novel, and something that depends for the machinery of its operation and the means of its execution on the apparatus furnished by scientific invention and discovery, often in the laboratories of our colleges. The world has acquired through modern science, as it were, a new nervous system. The network of railways that cover the continent, the cables that pierce every sea, the wireless wonders of Marconi,—all these furnish a mechanism which is a nervous system to the world. What would it mean to a human being to acquire suddenly a new nervous system? Vastly more than that it means for the world.

When Whittier sang, at the laying of the Atlantic cable, "Round the world the thought of all is as the thought of one," he never dreamed of the Suez Canal or the trans-Siberian railway. The modern Paul Revere hangs no lantern and mounts no steed at midnight; he simply steps to a telegraph office and events are announced in San Francisco long before they occurred in Massachusetts. When the battle of New Orleans was fought by General Jackson, it was because he had not heard of the treaty of peace with England, signed two weeks before. Under such circumstances a national consciousness could hardly exist; the whole country could not possibly have the same information or take the same action at the same time. To-day our nation may throb with indignation from end to end before breakfast, may form a national resolve before high noon, and execute that resolve within twenty-four hours. That means that national passion is more terrible, national conviction more formidable, and international opinion more irresistible than ever before in the world's history.

And here is the answer to those who say, "How are you going to enforce the decisions of the Hague Tribunal?" We answer, "There is no need of any army to enforce the decisions of all nations upon any one nation." There is no need of navies or armies to execute the decree of the entire civilization of the globe on any one factor of that civilization. The old ecclesiastical motto has application far outside the church: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*" (the whole world is sure to be right). The opinion of the whole world is self-executing. College men are the ones who ought to take charge of this new mechanism, and make it the implement of righteousness and peace.

I made a list the other day in my library of the men in the last century whose voices have been most potent against war and in favor of peace. On the list were such names as Voltaire, W. H. H. Lecky, John Morley, Frederic Harrison, Herbert Spencer—no one of whom would suffer himself to be called a Christian. Is it not strange that the great voices in fervent appeal to reason rather than to force should come from non-Christian sources? Are we proud of that fact? This Conference, I fully realize, is the offspring of Christian faith; but it is a rare thing indeed to hear from the Christian

pulpit to-day a ringing utterance against war, or a fervid utterance in behalf of international arbitration. Perhaps this explains why so few of our young men know Emerson's "Boston Hymn," and so many multitudes are thoroughly familiar with the splendid, virile, deplorable paganism of some of Kipling's lyrics. We need to come back to Emerson's noble summons :

"My angel, his name is Freedom, —
Choose him to be your king;
He shall cut pathways east and west,
And fend you with his wing."

The pathways are being cut. Let college men press in, and over those passes carry the message of "Peace on earth, goodwill to men."

One thing more. Our colleges and universities can give us a fresh reading of the story of creation, a truer idea of what the cosmic process is, by which our world has thus far been fashioned. We are suffering in many regions from a partial reading of the cosmic order, and a substitution of the cosmic for the moral order. I have no time to unfold this idea. Darwin gave currency to the conception that the lower orders of creation present everywhere a scene of relentless struggle, a struggle which results in the survival of the fittest and the extinction of the unfit. Friedrich Nietzsche has carried this doctrine into the realm of morals, and tells us that the law of the cosmos must be the law of man's spiritual nature as well. He frankly affirms that this is the part of the strong man, to "help nature in the elimination of the unfit, provided only that we use up the unfit in the production of the stronger man that is to be." This doctrine percolating down through all the strata of society is profoundly affecting our industry, our politics, our society. It determines Russia's attitude toward the Jews. It is radically changing our attitude toward the negro. It is affecting all modern diplomacy, —the idea that the strong nations of the earth are to administer the world, and the weaker nations must necessarily go to the wall.

Now the college, through its laboratories and its libraries, can show us that we have only partially read the story of the great world-order. Since Darwin died a whole host of facts have come to light, receiving poetic interpretation in the "Ascent of Man," by Henry Drummond, receiving scientific exposition in the last book of Prince Kropotkin, and teaching us everywhere that mutual aid is a factor in evolution. We are coming to see that the fittest to survive are not those with the strongest beak and tongue and claw, but those with greatest power to serve their fellows. We have come to see that the invalid in the sick chamber may render greater service than the stout mechanic; that not the bread-winner but the love-awakener is most needed in our strenuous civilization.

A truer idea of what the cosmic process has been, and is, will do much to rectify hasty inferences, and so unethical codes of conduct.

This, then, is what our colleges can do by the chivalry of true athletic sports, by teaching men the use of the powers and forces they are now discovering, by a clearer and deeper reading of the story of the world, they can help toward the consummation we so devoutly wish, and whose coming these conferences at Lake Mohonk are doing much to hasten.

Edwin D. Mead of Boston was next introduced, to continue the discussion.

AMERICA'S WORK FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

ADDRESS OF EDWIN D. MEAD.

The greatest education of public opinion, I conceive, is the life and work of a great and true man ; the best education, the life and work of the best type of man ; and in the field which concerns us, the man who has spoken the noblest word and lived the noblest life as touching the points we are here considering.

Reference has already been made here to Emerson. I rejoice that his memory is uppermost in our minds to-day. I count it auspicious that we meet here in precisely the week when America is celebrating the centennial of the birth of her greatest thinker. It becomes us to remember him here, for he had the highest message for us and the deepest sympathy in the matter of a humaner politics and a better organized world, which brings us together for conferences like this. For he brought to all such questions the true philosophy.

I was glad to hear President Faunce say what he did about the mischief that has been done to our people by a false interpretation of evolution. That word is imperative, and especially for our politics. For it is a fact that the doctrine of evolution came into our American and English world astride a poor philosophy of secondary cause, a philosophy without idealism or vision, and poisoned thereby. Men everywhere have had the notion that science has given its imprimatur to all manner of half and false conceptions about the survival of the fittest — by which they generally mean the strongest — and an inevitably cruel and selfish struggle for existence and supremacy and domination among men and among nations. The fact that the doctrine of evolution came into our world bound up with that false and mischievous philosophy has, I venture to say, made the sum total of the effect of the doctrine — which, rightly understood, is an inspiring doctrine and will duly work true beneficence — up to date not chiefly beneficent, but chiefly baleful, upon both religion and politics, and, in my opinion, more even upon politics than upon religion. We are seeing to-day its influence upon politics in our American and English world. Emerson saw the doctrine sanely and truly from the beginning ; he disposed of it under a

true philosophy; his vision swept, even before Darwin, the whole circle which it has taken us all the years from 1859 until the present to describe.

On this whole matter of peace and war, upon which we are trying to educate public opinion, how salutary are Emerson's high inspirations! How helpful it is to hark back to what he had to say about the barbarism and vulgarity of "musket worship," and to read again his noble essay upon War, tracing the steps by which man has advanced from ceaseless savage conflict to the plane where he makes the demands which we are here to reinforce and help make prevalent! Emerson was not a man who simply denounced war in general and in the abstract. He was one — like all of those whom we honor in his great generation — who knew well that it was the duty of the faithful citizen to denounce unjust war in the concrete, and especially unjust war in which his own government and people were engaged. It has been said here that we should not criticise our own nation, or say any derogatory word of our own government. That was not the view of Emerson — it was not for any such view that we honor our great thinker. Concord had good reason for another view. Emerson knew well that the men to whom the embattled farmers here in America in 1775 owed the most were the great men in England — Chatham, Burke, Fox — who did not hold that view, but who upon the floor of Parliament did criticise their government, and told the English ministry and king that they were in bad business. And when, in Emerson's own time, his own country was betrayed into the Mexican war, one of the most iniquitous wars in our history, the men of that generation whom we honor most, almost all, I think, whom we honor at all, were those — Channing, Sumner, Lowell, and all whom Emerson loved and trusted — who told the American government and people with energy and plainness that they were in bad business. That, as I understand it, is always the duty of a citizen in a democracy — to denounce unjust war in the concrete. That was what Emerson always did. Let us love our government and people, by all means; but let us never forget that the highest proof of love and honor is faithfulness, and never abdicate the democrat's primary duty of criticism and plain speech. It is in such plain speech that public opinion is best educated, and is alone rightly educated, in a democracy like ours.

But what I wish chiefly to say and to felicitate ourselves upon is that we stand at a time when we have reason to be encouraged. We have reason especially as peace men to be encouraged concerning war and its decline and doom in the world. The tendency of human history — this was never so plain as at this moment — is away from war. Half a dozen centuries ago every tribe and clan in Scotland was warring with every other; and when they were not warring with each other, they were all leagued together against England. When England was not fighting them, and often when she was, she was fighting France; and France was fighting her neighbors farther on. The world's history has been a history of seven years' wars and

thirty years' wars and hundred years' wars. War a little while ago was the regular business of nations, broken only by occasional respites of peace for the gathering of resources for new war. To-day, whatever lapses we have to deplore, that does not describe the situation. War to-day is an occasional spasm. We may not remit our efforts against the warfare and the exhausting armaments which exist; but we may encourage and refresh ourselves in perceiving that war is no longer the regular business of nations. In the education of public opinion, let this thing be dwelt upon; for I hold that in education few things are more important than the encouraging and inspiring view of history. As concerns the question of peace and war, the encouraging and inspiring view is the true view. History is on the side of the man who believes in progress. Let us in America push the education of public opinion in a way that shall hasten the progress.

It is an encouraging and inspiring thing—it is an education for us—to review, as Mr. Moxom did this morning, and as our Chairman has done, the history of our American diplomacy during the last century, and see and take to heart what a splendid record it is, what a splendid basis for further proceedings along the lines to which we are devoted here. It is an encouraging thing to review, as Dr. Trueblood reviewed for us a week ago in Boston, the history for three-quarters of a century of the American Peace Society, to see what wonderful advances it has made and what noble achievements stand to its credit. It is with pride and satisfaction that we can look upon the record of the peace movement in this country and declare that no other nation can point to broader or more influential accomplishments. The long activity of our Peace Society has been a work for the education of public opinion of the highest efficiency and significance, a work for whose wider and wider extension every one of us should earnestly coöperate.

It is precisely in the education and power of public opinion that America is preëminent. Mr. Holls has told us impressively of the immense reinforcement which our American Commission had at The Hague in the pressure and vitality of American public opinion behind it. English public opinion alone made itself equally felt at The Hague. What an immense satisfaction it is for all of us to remember here that it is an American citizen who has promised and provided for the Hague Tribunal a fitting and splendid home—given a million and a half of dollars to found at The Hague a Temple of Peace! You can remember, some of you, how, hardly half a dozen years ago, Dr. Hale and others of us were told here at Mohonk by a high authority that none of us now living might expect to see in our time a permanent international tribunal established. If any of us had been told then, while we were working to educate public opinion and stir up enthusiasm upon this subject to the proper point, that we should see that hope so quickly realized, and that we should see an American citizen giving a million and a half to the cause of peace, we could hardly have believed it. I said here last year that no other great cause has been so parsimoniously supported as this cause of

peace. I believe that we are now seeing the turning of the tide. The cause of peace from this time on is going, I predict, to be generously supported; and Mr. Carnegie's magnificent gift is a pledge and earnest of it.

You have reason to be proud in this great State of New York that the giver of this noble gift is one of your own citizens. At this moment the city of New York is brilliantly decorated, and its citizens are considering their municipal history of two hundred and fifty years. In the speeches made there yesterday and the day before, I find that the speakers went back to the beginnings of New York history and dwelt fondly upon the fact of the Dutch origin of the city and the state. New York had its cradle in Holland; and among the many things that bind New York and our country closely to Holland, this generous gift is the climax and the crown. In New England we remember always that it was Holland that welcomed our exiled fathers to her hospitable hearth,—and that it was an American, a New Englander, who in return gave Holland her best history; I think that he wrote some of it in that very palace at The Hague where the Peace Conference met. It was William Penn, the founder of an American Commonwealth, who in his famous Plan for the Peace of Europe appealed to the example of the United Provinces of Holland as demonstrating the possibilities and benefits of federation. It was our American Commission at The Hague which, on the anniversary of our independence, gathered the members of the Conference about the tomb of Grotius, at Delft, to do honor to the memory of that illustrious founder of international law. And now we rejoice that it is an American citizen, a citizen of this commonwealth, which owes to Holland its birth, who founds at The Hague this Temple of Peace. That one of your citizens, one of our citizens, should have done this deed binds you closer and binds us all closer to the Dutch Republic and to the nations of the world. The deed is an education for America and for mankind.

One of the most noteworthy and most fruitful things ever done by our American peace workers for the education of public sentiment was in the initiation of the International Peace Congresses in the middle of the last century; for it was our American peace workers, and in particular Elihu Burritt, who did take the initiative in that effort. The first of those great Peace Congresses was held at London, in 1843; the second at Brussels, in 1848; the third at Paris, in 1849; and there were others, at Frankfort and London. At the Paris Congress, over which Victor Hugo presided, there were two thousand members in attendance, and more than twenty American delegates. The American delegation at London was still larger. These International Peace Congresses have in these last years been revived, and many of you will be interested to know that a strong effort is being made to bring the Congress next year to America. Among all the things which it is in our power to do for the education of our people in the cause of peace in the immediate future, I believe that there is nothing more important than the securing of this

International Congress for America. We should expect large delegations from England, France, Germany and every nation of Europe. The principal convention would doubtless be held in New York; but meetings should also be arranged in St. Louis, in connection with the Exposition there, in Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington. Strong committees must be organized in each of these cities to promote the success of these conventions; and these committees, once organized, should never be disbanded, but made permanent centres of agitation and education in this cause. I can think of nothing that would stir up our people more in behalf of the cause of peace and arbitration than this International Congress here. I am glad to say that the interest in getting it here is earnest and substantial. Wealthy men in Boston and New York have it at heart. One public-spirited man has promised five thousand dollars towards the expenses; and others will faithfully and generously do their part. At this particular juncture in our politics and in world politics, it is fundamentally important that American thought and sentiment on international questions be kept pure and lofty; and there was never a time when a great International Congress here would do more good than now. The whole world stretches out its hands toward America to do her part justly and largely. Here again Emerson has spoken for us the strong and stirring word:

“ United States! the ages plead, —
 Present and Past in under-song, —
 Go put your creed into your deed,
 Nor speak with double tongue.

“ For sea and land don't understand,
 Nor skies without a frown
 See rights for which the one hand fights,
 By the other cloven down.

“ Be just at home; then write your scroll
 Of honor o'er the sea,
 And bid the broad Atlantic roll,
 A ferry of the free.”

The broad Atlantic, a ferry of the free,—not something that divides, but something that unites—that is what we want to see, and that is what we have to work for; and we shall work effectually for that when we make and keep our own policy true in every respect to the high principles for which our great thinker stood. From him better perhaps than from any other we can learn, at a time when false patriotisms work such mischief, what true patriotism is, and to what kind of patriotism we want to educate our people in this Republic. Emerson declared that his definition of patriotism was almost exactly opposite to that which is popular and common. Patriotism, he said, true patriotism, is the enthusiasm which a people feel in communicating its own special and representative advantages to humanity for the common good. What a definition is that for us to live up to and to seek to make our people realize! I know of no

better way in which we can honor Emerson to-day than by consecrating ourselves and our country to that enthusiasm and high purpose.

Dr. Trueblood was too modest in his *résumé* this morning of the progress of the last year. He did not speak of what I deem the greatest work with which he and the Peace Society have been associated. For I venture the claim that America has contributed this year to the work for the peace and better order of the world an effort of historic significance, in the proposition of our Peace Society for a Stated International Congress. The resolution asking our President and Congress to secure the coöperation of the other nations of the world to establish such a congress passed our Massachusetts Legislature unanimously, and has been transmitted to Washington for action there. The proposition is that our Republic shall invite all civilized nations to join in establishing a congress to consider regularly the world's common needs and report its recommendations to the nations for their action. Such an International Congress should ultimately perform legislatively functions corresponding to those which the Hague Tribunal performs judicially. Dreamed of again and again through the past centuries, this idea has now taken practical and definite form; and to America belongs the credit.

Indeed America is entitled to credit not always paid her for many things in this broad field. We pay tribute—and certainly pay it gratefully and generously—to the Czar of Russia for his initiative for the Hague Conference, which gave us the Hague Tribunal; but the thought of such a conference and such a tribunal did not originate in Russia. Hinted at by not a few great men of the past, it came originally in practical and definite form out of the heart of the American Peace Society, and particularly from the brain of William Ellery Channing. I wish that more of us were familiar with that noteworthy program and petition to our government drawn up by Channing, in 1816. It is a significant coincidence by which we celebrate within a week of each other the centennial of the birth of Emerson and the centennial of the beginning of Channing's great ministry in Boston. The American Peace Society was born at a meeting held in Channing's study; and it was Channing who penned the first careful and deliberate proposition, which he urged should go from our government to every government in Christendom, to establish what, after fourscore years, was finally established at the instance of the Czar of Russia.

When Channing printed that historic petition, I have noticed that in the three pages which it occupies in print he put just two words into italics. Those were the two words which we emphasize here to-day—*public opinion*. Public opinion certainly achieved something worth celebrating in the fourscore years which followed 1816. Let us see to it that it accomplish vastly more in the century ahead. Channing already saw that public opinion was king, as Mr. Macfarland has just now well reminded us that it is. It is king in Russia; it is king here. Our duty is to see to it that America's

contribution to international public opinion is made and kept sane and true and high, worthy of the great ideals for which the fathers of the Republic stood, and for which Channing stood, and Emerson.

The Chairman next introduced Mr. St. Clair McKelway, editor of the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

THE BEST MEANS OF PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION THROUGH THE AGENCY OF NEWSPAPERS.

ADDRESS OF MR. ST. CLAIR MCKELWAY.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am far from satisfied that I did well to be over-persuaded. Those who have preceded me have had the advantage of preparation and of time devoted to reflection. Such advantage as I have had for preparation has been confined to the period from the beginning of the meeting to-night to the present moment. The time that I might have given to reflection I was giving to hill climbing, to gorge viewing, to vista inspection and to the mastery of the difficulties between this place and Sky Top.

A cursory experience of that sort convinces me of the fitness of this place for a peace conference. There has been the greatest elemental war required to produce these scenes of grandeur, and to bring about this separation of rock and land, and of water from both, that could be conceived. Elemental violence must here have come to exhaustion of possibility. All is peace in Mohonk so far as nature is concerned, for nature is through. It seems to me, however, that our honored host must have done a great deal of unpeaceful blasting to produce some of the structural wonders that he has produced.

The subject, I believe, is the consideration of the best means of stimulating or organizing public opinion on behalf of international arbitration. I am expected to talk about the best means of doing that through the press. I can say only this, that the way to stimulate public opinion for arbitration is the way to stimulate public opinion on any other subject. It is the educational way; it is the exhibitive way; it is the argumentative way; it is the candid, the catholic, the considerate, the conciliatory way. My own impression is that if war had been prosecuted as fiercely as my friend Mr. Mead has contended for peace, there would have been much fewer wars than there have been in the history of the world. But a newspaper, in order effectively to arouse public opinion, must be disinterested. Its conductors must not advocate peace or war with reference to the effect upon their circulation or upon the ambition of their editors.

In the next place, if you want newspapers to stimulate effort for arbitration, you must go to independent newspapers. I do not say that the other sort are not influential, but you must not go to them to make them influential. Go to the party "boss," convert him, make

him in favor of peace and of arbitration. He will make the organization that way; the organization will make the organ that way. And although I esteem "organship" to be idiocy in the terms of print, you can nevertheless influence the party organs on either side by influencing the "boss" (on whichever side the organ you seek may be employed) to pipe or to dance, as the case may be.

But it is not enough that a newspaper be independent — it must be influential; and, my friends, it is difficult for it to be influential unless it is solvent. It is difficult for you to be independent unless solvent; it is difficult for you to be influential unless independent. Your paper must not only be on the right side of the dollar question, but it must be on the easy side of the living question before you can expect that it will be as effective as you would have it, as effective as the aspirations of its conductors would have it.

The living question with man or journal, with editor or reader, is the paramount question, and while he will not do anything ignoble, if a true man, even under the inspiration or necessity or prompting of the question of living, he will find his living in the printing of news, in the steering of special interests, in the creation of local, immediate, and, if you please, transient opinion, rather than in a losing pursuit, in an indifferent community, of so abstract a question as arbitration, international or national — by which I mean an arbitration between States in the Union through the forces of public opinion upon matters in dispute.

I was glad Mr. Macfarland was able to come here so fully prepared and equipped. He has read all of the reports of all of the Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration! I never knew a man to pay more attention to a subject than that, unless it was the actor who was cast for Othello and who blackened himself all over to feel the part.

Now, newspaper advocacy of international arbitration can never be principal, paramount and permanent; it must be incidental. Because, a newspaper to be effective must be interesting; to be interesting it must be varied, alert, enterprising, apt, shrewd, in touch with public opinion. And to be all that it must present a variety of subjects; it must give to each subject, as nearly as possible, its relative importance; it must give to great subjects, whether emergent or otherwise, prominent consideration. If the daily press of this country should turn itself into an advocate of international arbitration seven days a week, or six days a week, for six months or six weeks or six years, then the daily press would become a bore; and that would be fatal to the cause and fatal to the instrumentality. We have got to mix our advocacy with sense, with judgment, with proportion, with perspective. And I agree thoroughly with the President of the Conference that we have got to admit that there are subjects which arbitration will not comprise; which should not be submitted to arbitration; and there are wars upon which a nation should not refuse to go, although into every war a nation should enter reluctantly and with a profound realization of its responsibility to God and to man.

Allusion has here been made in antipathetic terms to the Mexican War. I believe that that was a war that had least excuse of any war in which the United States has ever engaged, but I believe that the motives of the majority of the people of the United States that engaged in that war were as respectable, and were as entitled to moral respect, as were the motives of the minority who opposed the war. And while, had I been living at that time, a man among men, instead of an infant in arms, while I would, under my present lights, have been against that war, I can understand that the war itself in the long plans of God, in the then inscrutable, but since and now plainly apparent, purposes of Providence, played a great part in the development of the United States. It was a war by which slavery sought room and extension; it was a war which saved the seeds of moral revolt in the Northern breast, and which at the last made the North and the majority of the entire Union a unit on the proposition, not that there should be freedom, not that there should be emancipation, not that there should be African suffrage, but that negro slavery should not be extended into more free territory. Of course the smaller purpose gave place ere long to the larger and final one. But because of the recoil from that unjust war, freedom at once obtained along the Pacific more territory than slavery seized along the Rio Grande, and eventually freedom became not only national, slavery became not only local, but freedom became universal and slavery was nowhere. And the Mexican war was but the prelude of those causes which enabled our people to rise from union to nationality, from nationality to emancipation, and from emancipation to manhood suffrage.

My friends, I beg pardon for digressing from the subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say a word for the newspaper men of Washington, who are to be represented in the next speaker. There is a good deal of criticism of the news sent out from Washington, but I say now, what I have had the pleasure of repeating often, that there is no body of professional men in Washington, and I doubt if there is in the country, that are represented by more honorable and upright and sincere men than the newspaper correspondents of Washington City as a whole.

We have with us a very worthy representative of that body of men in Mr. A. Maurice Low, who will now talk to the point for ten minutes.

A TREATY OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

ADDRESS OF MR. A. MAURICE LOW.

Mr. President: One of the first things that Mr. Macfarland learned when he went into the newspaper profession, and one of the things that Dr. McKelway has taught hundreds of his young men, is, when

you write a story, write it, tell it, and then get through with it. General Foster is my managing editor to-night, and I as a good reporter am just going to write my story, I am going to keep myself strictly to my subject, and that is, How to do it.

Senator Sherman said some years ago, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, "The way to resume is to resume." The way to arbitrate is to arbitrate. If I mention a name here I know it will meet with approval, because there was no man who did more for international arbitration than my dear and lamented friend Lord Pauncefote. It was Lord Pauncefote who, in conjunction with Mr. Olney, framed a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, but unfortunately the Senate did not ratify it.

I must take the Washington view of things. You have heard somewhat about Washington to-night, and Washington is of some importance. If the business man wants to secure the passage of a law, or wants to repeal a pernicious law, what does he do? He goes to Congress and asks to have that law passed or repealed. It seems to me that the thing for us to do, the practical thing to do, is to carry out General Foster's practical suggestion, to bring pressure to bear upon the Senate, not *en bloc*, but in detail.

If we should begin with a treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, the day after that treaty was ratified by the Senate the ambassadors of France and Germany and Russia, and the ministers from all over the world, would be waiting in the ante-room of the Secretary of State, begging the Secretary of State to negotiate a treaty of arbitration with their governments. And if that should be done, what would happen? In all probability Great Britain would negotiate a treaty of arbitration with France, France with Germany, Germany with Russia, and so on. Now that, it seems to me, is the practical thing to do. And it is coming to that, I believe; I am almost sure it is.

Allusion has been made by one or two speakers to the Alaskan Arbitration Commission. General Foster will go to England in a few days to argue that case; he hopes that the United States will win. I, as an Englishman, although a pretty good American,—because I married an American wife,—would like to see Great Britain win, because I think that Great Britain has the best of the argument. But there is something I would like to see better than that, which I shall see, and that is, that this dispute will be settled, settled once and for all, settled so that there will be no danger of war between the two countries over a few miles of worthless territory, for a few miles of territory which so called patriotism will not permit either country to give up.

The thing to do is to make separate and independent treaties by bringing pressure to bear on the Senate. And when that is done, as our esteemed Secretary said a short time ago, there will be just two classes to regulate the affairs of the world,—the lawyers to argue these cases before the International Court of Arbitration, and the newspapers to decide them.

Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, was then introduced and closed the discussion of the evening.

THE MONTHLY MAGAZINES AND ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF MR. BLISS PERRY.

Mr. President, Friends of the Conference: I have been asked to discuss in five minutes the bearing of this question, the means of securing publicity for the cause which we have at heart, upon the policy of the kind of periodical literature in which I am personally interested, that is, the monthly magazines. And I want to indicate one or two difficulties that confront us at the very outset.

One of the last talks which I had with Mr. Charles Dudley Warner before his death gave him the opportunity of saying this: that in all the years he had been writing for the magazines he had never but once, writing, as one must, three months in advance of publication, hit the particular topic in which people were deeply interested on the day of publication, and that was his discussion of the Pan-American Conference. To discuss any of these public questions in a monthly magazine is like trying to shoot rabbits up in the country, where the rabbit jumps from one clump of woods to another and you only have a minute to get him. Gentlemen like Mr. McKelway have a sort of instantaneous apparatus for knocking the rabbit over at the moment when everybody sees him, but in a monthly magazine you have to make up your mind three months beforehand which way he is likely to jump.

And, furthermore, we are confronted by another great difficulty. That section of the people who read the monthly magazines seem to have a great distrust of any "ism," and I suspect that many of them believe that international arbitration is a sort of "ism." If an appeal for a world legislature passes the Massachusetts Legislature without debate you may be sure that the great mass of that body think that it does not amount to much one way or the other. People like what is concrete, and if we were able to present in the monthly magazines such a *résumé* of recent events in arbitration as we had this morning from the President and from Dr. Trueblood, we should be glad to do so. And I hereby pledge myself that if either of those gentlemen will write it out, it shall have the honors of print, because that is something tangible. Everybody can point to it and say, "That is something practical; something that has actually been done."

And, furthermore, we have one other difficulty, and that is in securing, in the discussion of such questions as this, good-tempered criticism. You can get, at an hour's notice, a bitter, sour, pessimistic article on this question, or on any other; there are always contributors of that sort whom you can call upon if you want them. But to debate a great moral question of this sort with adequate information and at the same time with a perfect fairness, urbanity and good

temper, is to ask of the contributor the qualities which very few contributors possess.

Though I do not belong to the Peace Society, I am an extreme radical on the question which we are discussing to-night. I believe, personally, that every dollar added to the national armaments of the world puts off by just so much the coming of the kingdom of heaven. And I feel so strongly on that subject that I suppose I could write an emotional editorial upon it to-morrow. But it would not do any good at all. Unless you can meet your friends on the other side, who are just as patriotic as you are, with absolute fairness, with equal knowledge of the facts, and with a serene temper, there is no use for you to contribute to an American monthly periodical. The readers of these periodicals want the concrete rather than the abstract, and they want a good-tempered discussion rather than a diatribe.

We have, I believe, heavy sins to atone for in the amount of space that periodical literature has given in the last five years to war. I believe that we have fostered the military spirit. I believe that we have gone to the utmost possible lengths in portraying the ghastly scenes of the battlefield. But I believe many of you fail to take into account the service that periodical magazines are doing in bringing men together. You are sure to find something in every magazine which will make you feel that men are brothers the world over. And I believe that just so far as magazines are fostering that spirit of universal brotherhood they contribute in the best way to make men feel that they are one at heart. I remember my own irritation in Germany. Whenever I met a German lieutenant on the narrow sidewalks of Strassburg I had to take to the gutter. I was very angry about it for a few weeks, but after I began to meet those men at dinner, and began to talk with them, I found that it was a system of military etiquette which compels the officer to take the right of way. And as soon as I got that into my head I could no longer be angry with them personally. Every time you shake hands with an Englishman or a Frenchman or a man from the East, who is interested in the same problems that you are, literary, artistic, scientific, and brings to them an acumen perhaps greater than yours, just so far you are hastening the day which we all want to see.

And I believe that our monthly magazines are quickening the coming of that good time. After all, it is at bottom a religious question. I don't see what good it will do to stick up in the trolley cars mottoes about international arbitration if men with bitter race hatred in their souls are sitting on the seats. I believe it may be a good thing for the world to have a new nervous system, but after all it is a far greater thing to have a new heart.

The Conference then adjourned till 10 o'clock Thursday morning.

Third Session.

Thursday Morning, May 28, 1903.

The President called the Conference to order at 10 o'clock and announced that the morning's discussion would be on the "General Subject of Arbitration."

Addresses were delivered by Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D., Editor of the *Outlook*; Professor Jean C. Bracq of Vassar College; Hon. Everett P. Wheeler of New York; Hon. Samuel J. Barrows of New York, Corresponding Secretary of the New York Prison Commission; Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D. D., Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions; Dr. Josiah Strong, Secretary of the League for Social Service; Professor George G. Wilson of Brown University, Providence, R. I.; Professor C. P. Fagnani of Union Theological Seminary, New York; and Mr. Sadazuchi Uchida of New York, Consul General of Japan.

Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D., Editor of the *Outlook*, was first introduced and spoke as follows:

ARBITRATION AS AN IDEAL, AND ITS PRESENT LIMITATIONS.

ADDRESS OF REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: What I am going to try to do this morning is to make a confession of faith; not to argue for anything, only to state my own view of the subject of international arbitration. It will undoubtedly differ from some of the views which are entertained in this Conference by some of its members, but a conference is for the interchanging of differing views.

Man is emerging from the animal into the spiritual. He is a mixture, part animal, part spiritual; and in the world at large men in all the various stages of that development are to be found. In so far as men have emerged from the animal into the spiritual, in so far as they have reached that stage of progress in which they are amenable to the force of reason and of conscience, in so far arbitration can take the place of force. In so far as they have not emerged from the animal into the spiritual, in so far as they are still under the domination of the animal passions, uncontrolled by their own reason and their own conscience, they must be controlled by the reason and the conscience of others. Arbitration as a means of settling all disputes between man and man in the community, between class and class in the

community, and between nation and nation in the world, is an ideal toward which we are constantly seeking to approximate ; but it is an ideal which lies yet in the future. We have made progress toward it, we shall make more progress toward it, but the time has not yet come when force can be dispensed with and the appeal to the reason and the conscience can always take its place.

There are some people with whom arbitration is absolutely impossible. You cannot arbitrate with a South African tribe ; the South African tribe wouldn't know what the proposition to arbitrate meant. When the Puritans went to their church in their village they properly took their arms with them ; and if a body of savages with yells came out from the woods to attack them and to carry off their wives and children into a captivity that was worse than death, they were not prepared to arbitrate the question whether their wives and children should be carried off into a captivity worse than death. They met the bow and arrow with the rifle, and they did what was right. To-day in New York the Italian workmen and the contractors in the subway have gotten into a controversy. The contractors have proposed to the Italian workingmen to arbitrate the questions between them, and the Italian workingmen have replied, "We will not arbitrate unless you agree to our terms while the arbitration goes on." If it takes two to make a quarrel it also takes two to make an arbitration, and if these Italian workingmen will not submit the question between them and their employers to arbitration it cannot be submitted to arbitration. There are, thus, some people, not merely in the wilds, but in our own country, with whom arbitration is impossible.

As there are some people with whom arbitration is impossible, so there are some questions that cannot be arbitrated. When individual workingmen go to work in the subway, and a mob of Italians proceeds to stone them, there is no question raised that can be arbitrated. The question whether in America an individual man may work for an employer without asking the permission of a trade union is not a question to be submitted to arbitration. There are some questions that have been settled by the centuries that are passed. The right of the free man to free labor is one of those questions, and when in free America that right is resisted by force it must be defended and maintained by force.

I do not propose to argue the question of the Monroe doctrine. Whether it is wise or unwise for us to have assumed a certain guardianship over the South American republics, whether having assumed that *quasi*-guardianship we now ought to give it up or not, are not questions for discussion at this Conference. But the question whether that Monroe doctrine ought to be submitted to international arbitration is a question for us to consider, because our topic here is international arbitration, and the proper subjects for it, and its limitations. Now, for my part, I frankly think that the question whether it is our duty to maintain a position of guardianship over the South American republics is a question for us to determine, not to be determined for us by European powers. I think our government was

quite right in saying, "We will not allow the Court at The Hague, in which the South American Republics are not represented, to determine for us what are our duties toward these, our weaker brethren."

The ideal of arbitration as the universal solvent of all difficulties — individual, class, national — is to be kept constantly before us; but the foundations for the realization of that ideal must be laid before in its fullness the ideal can be reached.

Last night reference was made to a prophecy of the Old Testament which foretold the time when the swords shall be turned into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks, and nations shall learn war no more. I ask you to consider the context; because in order to understand a text it is necessary to understand the context. The context is this: "And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." When shall they not learn war any more? When shall they beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks? When the law goes forth out of Zion; when men have come to realize in all this world of ours that law is divine, that God is in His heavens and God is on the earth; when men have learned to obey that law, guided by their reason and enforced by their conscience; when a broad education and a broad Christian civilization have made men out of the old animal race. Then they shall learn war no more; then they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Until that time the men who will not obey the divine law must be made to obey the divine law by the force and power of those that do.

In the past and in the present there are many divine forces at work in society helping on the time when reason shall take the place of force, and all questions at issue shall be solved by the conscience and the reason, not by the sword or the cannon.

There has been a great development of conscience and reason, so great a development of conscience and of reason that wars avowedly for conquest — like the wars of Xerxes or of Cæsar — are almost wholly impossible in Christendom. There has been a great development of humanity, so that the carnage of the battlefield is looked upon now with shuddering and horror, not with applause and with glory. There has been a great development of the commercial spirit. There is a good deal said against the commercial spirit in our time, but one thing is at least to be said in its favor, that it is radically and inevitably opposed to the war spirit. The commercial spirit has for its object the acquisition of wealth; the war spirit has for its effect, if not for its purpose, the destruction of wealth. The commercial spirit has for its purpose construction; the war spirit has for

its purpose destruction. These two spirits cannot remain in the same people, in the same epoch, at the same time.

The passion for greed may not be any nobler than the passion of militarism; the passion for acquisition may be in some sense less noble than the passion of militarism, but the two are inconsistent, one expels the other. And the very fact that we live in a commercial age makes it clear that we live in an age in which the force of human interest is against the passion for war.

Along with this development of the commercial spirit, the constructive spirit, the acquisitive spirit, there has grown up through steam and electricity, referred to last night, an intercourse of the nations. At the Southern Educational Conference the other day Mr. Ogden told this story: He said that President Woodrow Wilson was up among the mountains of Tennessee, and one of the mountaineers said to him, "Mr. Wilson, I suppose that you uns down there know some things that we uns up here don't know!" "Yes," said Dr. Wilson. "And probably there are some things that we uns up here know that you uns down there do not know." "Yes," said Dr. Wilson. "Well," said the mountaineer, "mixin' does larn folks." [Laughter.] Now we have been mixing. The railroad, the steamboat, the telephone intermingles us, and we are both learning something. The Frenchman and the Englishman and the Italian and the American intermingle and shake hands, and after they have once shaken hands they are less ready to beat one another with the closed fist. The mere intercourse of nations unites us and makes war less probable and more difficult.

Along with this intercourse of the nations there is an interchanging of thought and opinion, and out of this grows a public opinion with ever wider and wider sweep and with ever deeper and deeper influence, public opinion that transcends the local community, that transcends the boundaries of sect, that transcends the boundaries of the nations. No man is impervious to public opinion, and the more he protests that he does not care what the newspapers say about him the more you may be sure he does care. No nation is impervious to public opinion. I am glad that England remonstrated against the lynchings in the United States. I am glad that we have an opportunity at times to see ourselves as others see us. And it is well in turn that we should remonstrate against the cruelties that have been recently perpetrated in Russia, and enable them to see themselves as others see them. Public opinion has become an international force, reënforcing the conscience, reënlightening the judgment, and making war less necessary and peace more easy.

Along with this interchange of public sentiment there has been growing a Christian power, there has been growing a Christian civilization. Christianity has been growing more practical; it has been growing more aggressive; it has been growing less the luxury of the few and more the outputting and forthputting of life for the many. It has been growing to be a more missionary religion in the Roman Catholic Church, in the Protestant Church, and thus through the

missionary operations (using that term in its largest sense) Christianity has grown more and more pervasive,—that Christianity which is the heralding of the Prince of Peace.

So we are learning something of the law that comes out of Zion ; so we are developing something of the spiritual nature of man ; so we are growing up through the successive stages into that condition of human life in which men will need to go to war no more,—whether with the soldier's cannon or the policeman's club,—because the law will proceed out of Zion, because conscience and reason will enforce from within the law that no longer needs to be enforced from without.

The progress that has been made in this direction is manifested in many ways, but in nothing more, I think, than in the change that has taken place in the army itself. There are very few of us who realize what a constructive power the army is. We have looked upon it as simply a force for destruction, and therefore we have wished a smaller army, a less army, or the abolition of the army altogether. But we have come into an era in which the army is itself a great constructive power, laying broad and deep and wide the foundations of a Christian knowledge in new communities.

These papers which I hold in my hand are themselves an abstract which has been made for me out of a number of volumes of reports from the War Department. They include what the government has done in Cuba, in the Philippines and in Porto Rico, through the army, for constructive civilization. I am only going to read a few extracts as they relate to Porto Rico, because in Porto Rico the army has done nothing else ; there has been no fighting ; there the army has been purely a constructive agency.

[Dr. Abbott then read extracts showing that in Porto Rico the army has been a charity organization, distributing food after the hurricane ; that it has been a board of education, making the schools free and competent ; that it has been an election board, providing for fair and free elections ; that it has been a police board, forming a civil guard and patrolling the roads ; and that it has been a board of health, so that whereas epidemics of smallpox used to be frequent, now that disease has been stamped out.]

I will not go on. It seems to me that in nothing has the change of public sentiment throughout the world, the change of public sentiment in America, been more manifested, more signally marked, than in this conversion of the great armed force, supposedly organized simply for the purpose of destroying life and destroying property, into a great organization for the protection of property and for the preservation of life.

I remember that when I attended the first Conference at Lake Mohonk, an article had just been published by an eminent jurist saying that international arbitration was impossible ; it never had been and it never could be. I remember that we had a speech of some length in this house by a distinguished jurist and diplomatist,

insisting that arbitration never had been and never could be. We had that prophet of the modern times at that meeting, if my memory serves me right, Edward Everett Hale, who said that arbitration was not enough; we wanted a permanent court of adjudication organized like the Supreme Court of the United States, remaining, if not in continuous session, at least in continuous existence, to which all questions between Christian powers could be submitted. Most of us thought that an ideal which perhaps our grandchildren might live to see. I think there were few of us who thought that within less than ten years we should be here to see the ideal accomplished.

The Chairman next introduced Professor J. C. Bracq of Vassar College.

REMARKABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARBITRATION IDEA.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR JEAN C. BRACQ.

Mr. President: I came to Mohonk this year hoping that I should escape being called upon to speak, but the merciless Committee has not allowed me to escape. It is very hard for a humble French parson to follow such an eloquent abbot as the one that we have just listened to [laughter], and then to have to speak without preparation.

I wish to make just two remarks this morning. One of them is as to the change which has taken place in the arbitration idea before the world. Dr. Abbott has referred to the beginning of these Conferences a few years ago. One thing that impressed me in those early days was the timidity and the somewhat apologetic character which almost every speaker had. I am very happy to say that in the wider life of the world the idea of arbitration has come now to take, not a defensive or an apologetic stand, but an aggressive one. Since we began these meetings the idea of arbitration has been very rapidly disseminated. I am not one of those who feel it necessary to express regrets that it has not been more in evidence in the press; as far as the continent of Europe is concerned, it has had a very good place in the press. All of our great European dailies — I speak especially of those of the French world; I mean of Belgium, of Switzerland and of France — have given a very large place to arbitration, have published admirable editorials on the subject. And even our religious press has come to follow in their wake.

I wish to speak with respect of the religious press, but sometimes the editors of these speak of war as "a visitation of God." Our religious editors in France to-day speak of war as an international crime, and of arbitration as the only way of solving international difficulties. That is a very great gain, the very fact that these men have come to take a right view of the matter, and especially that they are not trying to put upon the shoulders of the Lord their national wrongs. [Applause.] There are some people who try to make us

think that we must go ahead of the Lord, in Mexico or elsewhere, to enable the Lord to do a great work for the world. I never like to make the Lord responsible for the mistakes of a nation. All nations make these mistakes.

We have seen this arbitration idea in France entering into our life in a very encouraging manner. We have seen it entering into our literature, into our art and elsewhere. During the last year the place where it has been most visible has been in our Parliamentary life. I refer with very great pleasure to a speech by M. Combes, the present Premier of France, a man very energetic, a man *fortiter in modo* and very *fortiter in re* also. He recently delivered a great speech in Paris at a banquet, in which he made the statement that not only the Court of Arbitration, the Tribunal at The Hague, was a necessary complement of the judiciary organization of the world, but that it was a practical instrument, and he felt certain it would be successful. Two or three weeks later the Socialists of France had their Mohonk meeting at Carmaux; perhaps Mr. Smiley will object to my using that term, so I will say that they held what the Presbyterians would call their General Assembly. At that meeting at Carmaux, ex-Minister of Commerce M. Millerand referred to the Tribunal at The Hague as marking a new era in the life of workingmen; and he urged his hearers to do everything in their power, to use all their influence, to get the government of France to enter into as many arbitration agreements as possible with other powers, to create so many ties, and such strong ones, that they could not be severed by war.

Very shortly after that we had another great speech in France which marks an epoch, I think, in our Parliamentary life. I refer to the admirable speech of M. Jaurès, which was delivered in a language as beautiful as that of Matthew Arnold, and uttered with the earnestness of a martyr; or rather, I should say that it was delivered with the earnestness of a prophet, for sometimes the martyrs are very silent. M. Jaurès kept the house spellbound for two hours. Somebody had said, before he began to speak, that the arbitrationists were dreamers. "We dreamers?" he said. "The dreamers are the men who for years and years have been heaping up men-of-war upon men-of-war and engines of destruction upon engines of destruction, and have been swelling the budgets until the nation staggers under them. And what results have they reached? They have only frightened us with the nightmare of international danger." He said: "You are the dreamers; we are the practical men. We offer you now to refer all our difficulties to international arbitration; when that is working well we will submit to the world the idea of a progressive disarmament." We must come to that, and the Socialists of France very generally are moving in that direction.

In connection with the entrance of the arbitration idea into the life of the French nation, I might refer also to the admirable work done by M. d'Estournelles de Constant. His letters and other efforts this past year have been very numerous, and some of them are worth reading. I remember one which begins something like this: "We

all unite in praising peace, but we must begin now to organize it and to make it a world reality." He has succeeded in gathering about him in the French Parliament a fair body of political men who are pledged to the idea of helping the government to make arbitration a reality in every case of international difficulty. And what has been done already is a sign that these political men are in earnest.

It is a great mistake to think that we French are such bitter enemies of the English. If you will go to our history you will find that that is a very erroneous idea, indeed; you will find that the two nations have been ten times more often united in a common purpose and in a common work than they have been in open hostility to each other.

Not only has the arbitration idea made great progress in France, but there has also developed the idea of the awfulness and the mischievousness of war, and we have had a movement like that in the army of the United States to which Dr. Abbott has so beautifully referred. I am not a great admirer of soldiers, though my ancestors were all soldiers in the army of Napoleon, as I know to my cost — for the legacies which soldiers leave to their descendants are sometimes far from pleasant. But the French army under the movement of this new spirit has been transformed, and our soldiers in Madagascar have become railroad builders, road constructors, telegraph operators, teachers, giving lessons to farmers and introducing new industries. I wish that I had the time to set forth what has been accomplished in that island.

The idea of arbitration is working its way and will work its way. Victor Hugo says that there are some ideas which when they have entered into the life of the world you cannot put down. This is one of those ideas, and I think it is going to crystallize in a great many international agreements. But the principle of arbitration in order to be efficient must be backed by a life which is correlated with it. It must be backed by international ethics, otherwise we shall do what is very frequently done with the law. Augier, one of our dramatists, has a character who says, "I have great respect for the law, inasmuch as I always get round it." We may make as many agreements as we please, but unless there is the growth of a life which corresponds with it, we shall be disappointed in the result.

I should like to see the growth of ethical life along two or three lines. First of all, the idea must be cultivated that all nations stand upon a common footing, that what is right or wrong for one is right or wrong for another. We should never claim that because we are a large nation, a potent nation, we may use other arguments than a weak nation. What is law for the one should be law for the other. Dumas, Jr., defined duty as "what we want the other fellow to do." There are some nations that like arbitration that way.

I will not refer to the question with which we have not to deal here, the Monroe doctrine, but there is a dispute at the present time about the Persian Gulf, where a nation is attempting to take an atti-

tude not at all in keeping with the principles we are advocating. The French got a coaling station there from the Sultan of Muscat, but three British men-of-war appeared and brought pressure to bear on the Sultan to induce him to drive out the French. The British claim to have established a sort of Monroe doctrine for the entire littoral of the Persian Gulf and to be paying the Sultan of Muscat a yearly indemnity, but the French have been there for the past ten years and have no disposition to be dislodged. It seems to me that this is a fit case for arbitration.

Then I want to plead for a greater spirit of international truthfulness. [Applause.] I was in Canada not long ago, lecturing on the Newfoundland question, and Sir Henry Louis, a member of the Supreme Court of Canada, made a most vehement arraignment of the American press for its misrepresentation and abuse of Canada — “and even the *Outlook*,” he said, “has done this.” I said to him, “But, my dear sir, the press in your country is just as unfair to Frenchmen in the matter of Newfoundland.” It is a fact which cannot be denied that nations are not fair to one another in their literature, in their periodical literature; and even in that invaluable literature, the daily press, they are not fair in speaking of their opponents.

There are many more things for which I would like to plead in the direction of international ethics, but I cannot. So I will conclude by saying that I am very glad others have spoken of the possible ethical work of the Church, of the clergy, and of international travel. I think a good deal of that last item. I have found that every man who has resided in France is more true to us for having lived among us; exactly as I have found that every man who has lived in America, when he goes back to France, is apt to be more American than the Americans themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reference has been made here to the good work which has been done by the New York Bar Association in promoting international arbitration, and we are now to hear from one of the distinguished members of that Association, Hon. Everett P. Wheeler of New York.

WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN ACCOMPLISHED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HAGUE COURT.

ADDRESS OF HON. EVERETT P. WHEELER.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to be here once more and to receive the hospitality of our host and to have the opportunity of addressing this audience.

I want to say a few words this morning in regard to the Tribunal at The Hague. You remember the beginning of Mr. Webster's great speech in reply to Hayne, that “when the mariner has been

tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude." So it seems to me that after a general discussion as to the future, it is a good thing to stop and see precisely what we have already accomplished. None of us expected, when we came here years ago, that we should have accomplished much by this time; but I think we may say without vanity that we have had our humble part in bringing about a strong public sentiment in favor of international arbitration, and thus in making possible the agreement arrived at in the Conference at The Hague.

The Convention there adopted recites, in the first place, that

"The sovereigns or heads of state of the countries represented at the Conference, animated with a strong desire to come to an agreement for the maintenance of general peace,

"Resolved to promote with all their ability the friendly settlement of international disputes;

"Recognizing the solidarity which unites the members of the society of the civilized nations;

"Wishing to extend the empire of law and to strengthen the sentiment of international justice;

"Convinced that the institution of a permanent arbitral jurisdiction accessible to all, in the midst of the independent powers, will prove efficacious in bringing about this result;

"Considering the advantages of a regularly organized general arbitral procedure;

"Believing, with the august initiator of the International Peace Conference, that there ought to be a consecration, by international agreement, of the principles of equity and right on which rest the security of states and the well-being of peoples;

"Desiring to conclude a convention to this effect, have named their plenipotentiaries,

"Who, after having communicated to one another their full powers, found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following Convention."

Certainly in no new treaty could we get a better preamble than that.

Then we have, in the first place, an expressed agreement:

"Article 1. With the object of preventing, as far as possible, recourse to force in the relations between states, the signatory powers agree to employ all their efforts to bring about by pacific means the solution of international differences."

Then there are provisions for good offices and mediation; then a provision for International Commissions of Inquiry, largely to assist in the solution of international disputes; then comes the establishment of the Court itself, and this is the first clause:

"Article 20. With the object of facilitating immediate recourse to arbitration for international differences which have not been settled by diplomacy, the signatory powers agree to organize a permanent court of arbitration accessible at all times, and exercising its functions, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary by the parties, in conformity with the rules of procedure laid down in the present Convention."

The provisions for the appointment of judges follow, and then this article :

“Article 27. The signatory powers shall consider it their duty, in a case where an acute conflict threatens to break out between two or more of their number, to remind them that the Permanent Court is open to them. Consequently they declare that the fact of reminding the parties in dispute of the provisions of the present Convention, and the advice given, in the higher interests of peace, to bring their dispute before the Permanent Court, can only be considered as an act of good offices.”

Then come provisions for procedure. Let me read you one of those to show how ample the provision is for the ascertainment of the real truth of the case :

“Article 39. The arbitral procedure consists, as a general rule, of two phases : first, the examination of evidence, and, second, the hearing. The first consists of the communication made by the respective agents to the members of the Tribunal and to the opposing party of all papers, printed or written, and of all documents containing the matters pleaded in the case. This communication shall take place according to the form and at the time fixed by the Tribunal by virtue of Article 49. The second consists of the oral discussion of the matters presented by the parties before the Tribunal.”

And then comes a provision for the taking of testimony and the submission of copies of agreements and documents put in evidence :

“Article 49. The Tribunal shall have the right to make rules of procedure for the direction of the trial, to determine the forms and the time within which each party shall submit its motions, and to determine all the formalities regulating the admission of evidence.”

Finally, there is provision for a motion for a new trial. Thus I have given you very briefly the substance of what we have already attained in that Convention.

If the nations are willing, or if any two nations are willing, to submit to that Court, they have at present under existing treaty the absolute power and right to do so, and they are under the most solemn pledge that the parties who go into an arbitration before this Court will submit in good faith to its decision.

It seems to me that we have obtained all the treaty we can ask, and that any agitation for a further treaty is inexpedient ; that the object of this Conference should be to enlighten and concentrate public attention and public sentiment upon the existence of this Court,—for which, as was said last night, a noble court-house is about to be provided,—and to induce the nations to submit to it whatever controversies may arise between them. There is no limitation in this treaty as to the character of the controversies to be submitted. It is a treaty between the United States and Great Britain as well as between the United States and France, or between the United States and Germany. It is just as binding upon these two countries as any separate treaty could possibly be.

It seems to me most honorable to the present administration that when it was offered the power to act as arbitrator in the Venezuela dispute it said : “No ; there is a court to which these questions

should be referred." I consider it a most fortunate thing that that very question which the President refused to arbitrate is now in process of submission to and ultimate determination by that Tribunal. It seems to me, on the other hand, an unfortunate thing that the question of the Alaskan Boundary should not have been referred to the Hague Tribunal.

Let me remind you that not only in the first few years, but for many years after the creation of the Supreme Court of the United States, its jurisdiction was the subject of jealousy and of dispute. Mr. Jefferson and even Mr. Madison used their influence (and it was used in Mr. Jefferson's case most strenuously) in opposition to the statute and to the enforcement of the statute which gave to that court the right to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court of an individual State on any question relating to the constitution or the laws of the United States in which the decision was adverse to the right claimed thereunder. Before the Civil War there was a Supreme Court in Wisconsin that refused to obey the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States on an appeal of that sort. Only sixty years ago that question still remained an open one; to-day we acquiesce in the decisions of the Supreme Court universally. I am persuaded that if the public sentiment of the nations is concentrated upon the support of the Hague Court, before the century has passed submission to its decisions and honor and respect for its jurisdiction will be as universal as they now are in the United States for its Supreme Court.

The Chairman then introduced Hon. Samuel J. Barrows of New York City, corresponding secretary of the Prison Association of New York, who spoke on

THE ABOLITION BY THE UNITED STATES OF NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

ADDRESS OF HON. SAMUEL J. BARROWS.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress: I noticed that Mr. Smiley, in making classification of members at the beginning of the Congress, divided them up into clergymen and lawyers and so on, but did not, I believe, mention the law-makers. Some of us who have been law-makers are a little proud of that title and function, because, you will remember, it was Moses who gave us such a fine illustration of it so many centuries ago, and he seemed to combine it in some way with the functions of a clergyman. I belong to that class. There are two classes of Congressmen, those who are in active service and those who are out; and of those who are out there are those who have been retired by their own will, and those who have been retired by the will of their constituents. I belong to the latter class.

I was thinking last night, as I heard this interesting discussion

which referred to what the Conference could do to make the government catch up — I was thinking what the government of the United States could do to make the Mohonk Conference catch up. As we discussed methods of informing and developing public opinion outside, I was thinking of some methods by which the Mohonk Conference could be informed. For some of the members of the Conference have confessed to me that they did not know that one thing which we all consider desirable and important for our government to do had already been done. While we are thinking how we can get the press and the government to do what we want to have done, it is interesting to find that the government is some four years ahead of us in one matter. It has done something which well deserves recognition and respect from this Conference. This step has been taken, not because of any agitation which we as a Conference or as individuals have taken, but because of the development of a certain sentiment in our army and navy.

Here let me say, in passing, that some of the most prominent of our army and naval officers are deeply interested in moral and religious questions. On my way back to New York I shall stop at West Point to visit an old army friend who is now the dean of the faculty. Some years ago he surprised his friends by publishing a book made up of the sayings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the New Testament. Another army officer, formerly commandant at West Point, has written two religious books, one of which has been translated into French. Another friend, a naval officer, who lives within a block of me, has just written a book dealing with various aspects of religion in relation to modern thought. I know of no persons in whom the spirit of humanity and justice finds nobler embodiment than in these three officers. Now the special thing I want to present to-day is the fact that it is through the navy of the United States in coöperation with the members of Congress that a certain reform has been brought about which I consider one of the most significant changes of recent years in our ethical code in regard to war.

You know we have the United States flag on all of our government naval vessels, but under that we have had a pirate flag. The public have not seen it distinctly, but the officers have seen it, and the sailor has seen it. The United States flag has said to them, "You go into war for the sake of your country;" but the pirate flag has said, sardonically, "You go into war for what you can make out of it." Well, the United States has pulled down that pirate flag, and it is a great thing to have done.

If you examine the motives which lead to war, you will find that the motive of pillage is one of the most ancient. It carries you back to the time of Homer. This same motive has persisted all the way down to our recent war with Spain. We have awarded a large sum of money to certain naval officers and men who took part in it. A long time ago we gave up the pillage of property on land. We gave up the right of soldiers to take property for their own uses. But while property on land has been respected in war for a long

time, and when taken under stress of war is paid for, the spoils of war have been still divided among our sailors, the greater part going, as in Homeric times, to the chieftain and the rest to the sub-officers and men. During our Civil War many millions of dollars were derived from the capture of vessels and divided among the officers and men of the navy. In the war of 1812 a great sum of money was divided among our privateers. England has distributed prize money at an enormous rate. The English have maintained that it is necessary for the efficiency of the service to hold out this inducement of prize money. This is very frankly stated by an English naval officer, who argues that human nature requires some such incentive in addition to motives of patriotism. That is the English naval sentiment. It has stood in the way of getting England to recognize and accept the doctrine of the inviolability of private property at sea.

The sentiment in our own navy, however, has gradually taken a different direction. There has seemed to be no reason why army and navy officers should not be on precisely the same basis, so far as any profits from war is concerned. Four years ago, that is, in 1899, our naval officers said to the Congress of the United States: "If you will give us a grade equal to the army, if you will give us pay equal to the army, we will forthwith ask you to abolish prize money." Congress passed that act on March 3, 1899. It was one of the last bills I had the pleasure of voting for.

To render war less probable, it is important to remove the motives and excuses which lead to it. The abolition of prize money is an important step in this direction. I wish, therefore, that this Conference, which has hitherto taken no notice of the fact, might approve the action of our government in giving up the practice of paying prize money to officers and men in the United States service, and might commend this example to the consideration and imitation of all civilized nations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to put myself on record as to the utility of foreign missions, and the obligation resting upon the churches and the Christian nations to prosecute the work of foreign missions. Those who have received the blessing which we have received from foreign missions, which carried the gospel to our ancestors centuries ago, ought to be willing to carry the same blessing to those who are without it. I now have the privilege of introducing a man who has traveled in foreign lands in the interest of missions, and who will be able to bring to us a message about the subject which we are discussing this morning, Rev. Arthur J. Brown, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.

JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS TOWARD THE PEOPLES OF THE ORIENT.

ADDRESS OF REV. ARTHUR J. BROWN, D.D.

I shrink from addressing this distinguished assembly on such short notice, for I feel that the dignity and the influence of this Conference merit careful preparation. Possibly, however, the Committee feared that time for preparation would mean too long a speech.

I disclaim the right to speak for the great body of foreign missionaries throughout the world, and yet I am sure that I am right in saying that this Conference has no more ardent sympathizers than the foreign missionaries of all denominations, and that at hundreds of lonely outposts men are thinking of this Conference, and as they think of it, thank God and take courage.

We believe in arbitration, not because we are afraid to fight, not because we are unable to fight, not because we are unwilling, if necessity should arise, to fight, not because fighting destroys property and demoralizes business and entails bloodshed and anguish—but we believe in arbitration because it is right, eternally right, and because it should therefore be employed whenever practicable in the disputes which arise between nations.

But arbitration, if it is to be successful as a means of averting war, must not be a merely artificial convention. It must rest upon the solid foundation of justice and fairness and mutual respect between man and man.

Here there is a great preliminary work to be done. The scope of our inquiry must extend beyond the so-called Christian powers to the teeming millions of the Orient. It cannot be denied that the attitude of the European and American toward Asia is one of condescension not unmingled with contempt. The typical Anglo-Saxon apparently regards himself as the lord of creation, and he does not hesitate to act upon that assumption. But the Asiatic is proud. The Asiatic is sensitive. He is as attached to his institutions as we are to ours. Indeed, he believes them to be superior. An Oriental envoy to the coronation of King Edward VII. is reported to have exclaimed with a sigh of relief as he turned his face homeward: "England is a great country; but I am glad I am going back to civilization again!"

Nor are these peoples so much our inferiors as we are wont to imagine. As I think of the men I met in a fifteen months' tour around the world, five stand conspicuously in my thought as the most striking men that I saw. Not one of them is a European; not one is an American. The men to whom I refer are: Chatterjee, a Christian minister of India; Yuan Shih Kai, then Governor of Shantung, China, but now the successor of Li Hung Chang as Viceroy of Chihli; Kataoka, President of the Lower House in Japan; Chulalongkorn, King of Siam; and last, but not least, a subject of that king, the Christian leader, Boon Boon Itt.

I have often been asked, What is the most remarkable thing that you saw in a journey around the world? I reply that the most remarkable thing I saw was a man! I do not mean man in the abstract, or men in multitude, or man in position. But I mean man irrespective of the place which he occupies; or of the language which he speaks, or of the color of his skin, or of the manner of his living. I found him to be of like passions with ourselves, appreciative of justice, responsive to kindness, —

“ Heir of the same inheritance,
Child of the selfsame God,
Who has but stumbled in the path
We have in weakness trod.”

Ruskin reminds us that the common mud of the streets is composed of clay, sand, soot and water, and that the clay may be changed into the radiance of the sapphire; that the sand may be clarified into the beauty of the opal; that the soot may be crystallized into the glory of the diamond; and that the water may be transformed into a star of snow. So I believe that man in Asia and Africa, as well as in Europe and America, may, by the power of God's Spirit, be purified and ennobled into the kingly dignity of divine sonship. I do not believe that we are ever going to make much headway in this matter of arbitration until we understand the sublime truth that God loves all men, and that since He loves them, we should.

Let us frankly confess that we have not always acted in accordance with the principles that we profess. The history of the relations of European nations to Asia has been characterized as a history of rapine, cruelty and fraud.

Take, for example, the occurrences of the last six years in China. In December, 1897, Germany took possession of Kiao-Chou Bay. The following spring, Russia virtually seized Port Arthur, the British took Wei Hai Wei and the French Kwang Chou Wan. The English already had the important gateway of Hong Kong, and the French the strategic entrance to Tonquin, while at Shanghai Europeans held the door to the great valley of the Yang-tze. When the Boxer outbreak occurred, China did not have a single harbor in which she could mobilize her own ships without the consent of the arrogant foreigner. And then, when the Chinese, goaded to blind fury, rose in indiscriminate massacre of all white men, there were actually some people who accused the missionaries of having precipitated the outbreak!

I am glad to report that in repeated interviews with princes and magistrates in Asia, I found a general admission that the United States stands before the people of the Orient to-day as representing a higher type of justice between man and man than any other nation in the world. I suppose it may be asked: How does this accord with our possession of the Philippine Islands? I can only reply in these brief remarks that we did not seek the Philippines, that we were driven there by the force of circumstances, and that the

Filipinos to-day, under American rule, have a larger measure of true freedom than ever before in their history.

Do we realize to what an extent the peace of the world is jeopardized by some of the events which are occurring in Asia? It was recently agreed that no foreign power should build railways in Persia. But Russia obtained a concession to construct carriage roads, and she so carefully graded them that they need only ties and rails in order to make excellent railroads; and doubtless the ties and rails are waiting in some quiet spot near the border. Does anybody believe that Russia intends to withdraw from Manchuria? The Czar is one of the foremost advocates of peace, and yet everybody knows that the policy of Russia, which even a Czar cannot control, can only be likened to a glacier—huge, cold, slow, steady and irresistible.

The greatest cause for alarm arises from the contest between Russia and Japan over Korea. Russia desires the possession of that great peninsula in order to have ports which are ice free at every season of the year. Japan justly feels that she could not, without serious danger to herself, permit a great military power like Russia to entrench herself at Fusan, only ten hours ride from Shimonoseki, the gateway to the inland sea of Japan. Accordingly, Japan has developed one of the best armies in the world, while in the last six years she has spent a hundred millions in building a modern navy, and during the next six years she expects to spend a hundred millions more. Meanwhile, France is steadily encroaching on Siam and half a dozen powers are hovering like vultures about the enfeebled body of Turkey.

Now it is futile to expect that war can be averted in Asia or anywhere else simply by civilization or by secular education. Europe has civilization; Europe has secular education; and the ruthless ambitions of Europe to-day are the chief menace to the peace of the world. From the Garden of Eden down, the fall of man has been due to what George Adam Smith has characterized as the increase of knowledge and of power unaccompanied by reverence. "The Song of Lamech echoes from a remote antiquity the savage truth that the first use of power is to equip hatred and render revenge more deadly." We must understand that, if we are to have peace, we must go to the character of the individual man. Herbert Spencer justly reminds us that there is no political alchemy by which we can bring golden conduct out of leaden motives. And Mr. Moody expressed the same truth less elegantly, but more forcibly, when he said that if we wish to get pure water, it is not enough to paint the pump; we must clean out the well.

The only hope of peace for this world of passion and tumult lies in the prevalence of that gospel which teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the cleansing of the human heart and the power of the divine life. Those who preach and exemplify that gospel at home and abroad are doing more to create the conditions of peace than any others. Treaties and conventions can only

record the successive stages which are thus reached. When the gospel of Christ shall universally prevail, then, and only then, will dawn that age of gold of which we sung at the opening of this Conference :

“ When peace shall over all the earth
Its ancient splendors fling,
And the whole world send back the song
Which now the angels sing.”

THE CHAIRMAN : Dr. Josiah Strong, whom I now have the pleasure to introduce, has written a book on “ Our Country,” a book which we ought all to read.

PRESENT TENDENCIES TOWARD THE UNITY OF THE WORLD.

ADDRESS OF DR. JOSIAH STRONG.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference : I was once asked to make a three-minute address on the “ Evidences of Christianity.” [Laughter.] I did it, which encourages me to undertake a ten-minute talk on a new world tendency which, beyond peradventure, will ultimately realize the permanent world peace. There is strength in the thought that this great consummation of a world peace is not our work and God our helper, but it is His work and we are His helpers. All nations and reformers everywhere like to believe that God is on their side. It is far more important to have a rational conviction that we are on God’s side. I venture to think that even in ten minutes I may help to show you that those who are seeking and working and praying for the great consummation of international peace are on God’s side. This assurance ought to give us patience to wait and inspiration to work for its full coming.

If the Mississippi Valley were tilted only a few hundred feet the great river would empty into the Arctic Ocean instead of the Gulf. The reversal of this current would profoundly affect the future of the United States. Far more profound are the results which are to follow the reversal of a great world tendency as old as life on this planet. During all the past that stream of tendency has been toward diversity; in all the future that stream is to be toward oneness. This profound change has taken place during the lifetime of our honored and beloved host.

Students of civilization are now attaching far more importance than formerly to physical conditions. The vital law is recognized that life must adapt itself to environment,—the wing to the air, the fin to the water, the foot to the ground,—and that when environment radically changes life must readjust itself under penalty of death.

When human life began, increasing population created a pressure which induced a movement outward. Men came under different environments, which resulted in differences of habits, customs, characteristics of social organization and of political organization, in one

word, of civilization. As men became isolated, peoples who once spoke the same tongue became estranged. A language, like everything else that lives, grows, and hence with this increasing distance from one another grew up increasing barriers to communication. Thus, down to the nineteenth century, the peoples of the earth were isolated from one another in radically different environments which tended constantly toward differentiation. But during the past century a profound change took place. Under the influence of steam and electricity distances and differences are now being overcome, and intercommunication is producing its far-reaching results. The industrial revolution produces certain conditions wherever it goes, and that revolution is journeying round the world. Emerson — and I believe that every one who speaks to-day is expected to make at least one quotation from him — Emerson says that coal is a portable climate, which is equally true of ice. To-day the climate of one country may be shipped to another. With coal, ice, furnaces and the products of our manufactures, we find that homes are being equipped throughout the world in much the same way, producing substantially the same conditions and much the same climate. In many places in Cairo and Constantinople the American might imagine himself in Chicago or in San Francisco.

In like manner, the press is producing a climate of opinion which is growing wider and wider. Millions are reading the same printed page. It would be interesting to study to what extent Shakespeare has served to harmonize the thinking of different nations. The same is true of the Bible. In like manner, science is every day transferring something from the region of opinion — which is the region of discussion and difference and often of quarrel — to the region of known fact; and thus every day is being broadened the ground on which all men may stand, and on which all intelligent men do and must stand.

In like manner, for centuries the tendency in matters of religion was toward diversity. Now that tendency is reversed, as illustrated in the Pan-Anglican, the Pan-Presbyterian and the Pan-Methodist assemblies of which we hear. And some of us venture to hope that some day there will be a Pan-Christian assembly; that some day there will be a "Pan" big enough to hold us all.

I simply remind you — I cannot stop to develop the fact — that all these causes which for thousands of years tended to create differences now tend to produce likenesses, because the differing environments of different peoples are now being harmonized and constituted practically one environment of the civilized world.

Let us not imagine for a moment that the work of the future is to *undo* the work of the past. Differences were necessary to development. There can be no high life, organized life, without differentiation of organs and functions. If men everywhere had been alike there could have been little progress in civilization.

"God fulfills Himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

Harmony is nobler than unison. The great work of the past has been to develop the differing instruments for a vast world orchestra, and history has been filled with the discords of their making. But we are to-day well entered on the work of harmonizing, and the time will surely come when they will be attuned to heaven's keynote of law and of love. The angel song of nineteen centuries ago has waited long for earth's antiphonal, but every year brings nearer the time when all peoples and kindreds and tongues shall join in the Gloria in Excelsis, "On earth peace, goodwill to men."

Professor George G. Wilson of Brown University was next called upon and spoke upon

THE NAVAL WAR CODE OF THE UNITED STATES.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR GEO. G. WILSON.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: If I may be allowed to take a somewhat special phase of the general topic, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the reasons why the United States can afford to take a lead in advocating international arbitration.

The subject of an appeal to the Senate, which was well presented in the President's address, is an important one, as it presents to us the one way in which we can bring about certain results. There is no question, on the general subject, that the United States, because of its open policy, its straightforward diplomacy, particularly under the direction of the present able Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, can afford to say: "We are perfectly willing to submit our claims to a court of arbitration. Our claims are based upon justice, therefore we have nothing to fear from any court of just and able men." That much on the general subject itself.

Mr. Barrows has referred to what has been taking place in the navy of the United States. Mr. Macfarland last evening spoke of the attitude of the officers of the army and navy toward war; that they are not anxious for war. This bugle which sounds here in the morning day after day reminds me of a bugle that wakens me during a part of the year when it is my good fortune to be upon the staff of the United States Naval War College, who are called upon to have somewhat to do with international law. The subject of international law, which has grown much in importance within the last few decades, must be thoroughly familiar to all the members of the Conference.

If on general principles we can, as a nation, submit our disputes to arbitration, then if our officers of the army and navy are directed by the principles of international law that are accepted throughout the world, we can afford even to submit the minor points of their action to arbitration. You all know that we have accepted the Convention adopted at the Hague Conference in regard to the laws and

usages of war upon land; that very text has been adopted for the use of our army.

There was in 1890 prepared and submitted to the Secretary of the Navy of the United States a code known as the Naval War Code, the laws and usages of war upon the sea. That code was drawn up and was supposed to embody, and did embody, to the best of the ability of the men who prepared it—it was prepared under the direction of Captain Stockton, now naval attaché at London—the principles of war upon the sea which were generally accepted throughout the world. A part of those laws were presented to the Hague Conference, and we should be glad to have any questions about their application submitted to the Hague Court for decision.

The other nations of the world were not ready at the time to go with us. We therefore issued under the sanction of the Secretary of the Navy, for the guidance of all the officers of the navy, a war code which embodies the principles of right warfare. Now if we have adopted the principles of right warfare, we should naturally be willing to submit any questions that relate to war to a court of arbitration, either before or after the event, because we struggle for justice only, and in a just manner.

This naval code has had a very decided influence. It has been criticised throughout the world, criticised, however, favorably. Since this Conference began, I have received criticisms of it just made in France and England. It is the first code of its kind in the history of the world. Formerly we used to have the principle, "All is fair in love and war." All is not fair in war at the present time. There are many things that used to be fair that are not now fair in war. The change has been marked, and particularly marked in naval warfare. Mr. Barrows has explained about the disappearance of that incentive to bad warfare, prize money; and the officers of the navy, I think, from a considerable contact with them, are very glad to see the last of prize money, and to have war put upon the principles of fair play, and fair play only.

It is now possible to have just action throughout the entire naval world, wherever it may be. England has within a week—I happen to have the papers here before me—prepared a draft of a naval war code similar to the one which the United States adopted in 1890. There are twenty-seven pages of it, and that is all; that is a very short code for naval war. A single feature of it will show you how far we have gone ahead of the other nations in this matter. Formerly it was possible for a vessel approaching another to raise the flag of a neutral; that is, if the United States and Spain should be at war it was possible for a United States vessel approaching and desiring to attack a Spanish vessel to raise the flag of Great Britain until it came within the range of the vessel, and was ready to fire, and then put out the flag of the United States. England and all the other nations of the world, with the exception of the United States, still allow that practice. The United States naval war code in Article 6

says, "The use of false colors in war is forbidden." That sort of a basis of action makes it possible for us to say to the nations of the world, as Mr. Hay said in his Chamber of Commerce speech: "Let us be diligent in our business, and we shall stand — stand, you see, not crawl nor swagger — stand as a friend and equal, asking nothing, putting up with nothing but what is right and just among our peers in the great democracy of nations." So the United States, with these principles actuating it, can look to international arbitration and say, "We are ready to stand, stand as a nation among its peers."

THE CHAIRMAN: We were talking last night about how we are to influence public sentiment. It is largely through the Church, through the pulpit, and through the theological seminary, that public opinion is formed. We are now to have an address from a representative of our theological seminaries, Professor Fagnani of the Union Theological Seminary of New York.

CO-OPERATING WITH GOD.

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR C. P. FAGNANI.

This Mohonk Conference is trying to work a miracle. What a miracle is exactly even theologians have difficulty in defining. A lawyer was trying to get a witness's opinion on this subject, and he said to the witness: "Now suppose that you saw a man falling from the sixteenth story of a building, and when he reached the ground you examined him and found that he had not received a single injury; what would you call that?" The witness replied: "I would call that an accident." "Now suppose that the very same man a few days later should again fall from the sixteenth story of the building and escape without injury; what would you call it then?" "I should call that a coincidence!" The lawyer said: "Now look here, I want you to understand my point. Suppose that happened for a third time; what should you say then?" "I should call that a habit!" [Laughter.]

Now this Mohonk Conference is trying to create in the world the habit of appealing to the Hague Tribunal instead of fighting, and of course it seems to the uninitiated an absolutely futile and chimerical scheme. Only the second day from my return from this Conference last year, on the 1st of June, I happened to read in the newspaper of a magistrate in New York City before whom a man was brought on the charge of slapping another man in the face. And this was the magistrate's judgment: "If the plaintiff didn't slap back he was a fool. I discharge the defendant." That was a magistrate in New York City, a representative of the judicial mind.

Now as to the case of the educator: we expect educators to be at

the very forefront of moral questions. The following is from the *Congregationalist* of January 31, 1903 :

“ THE FIGHTING INSTINCT IN BOYS.

“ Two boys can never become chums until they have had a fight. The reason girls are not such true friends is because they will not fight, they only sputter. A fight, like an electric storm, clears the air. Boys’ gangs have a finer fellowship than groups of girls because they keep the air clear.

“ The boy who is not allowed to fight or who won’t fight does not lack the pugnacious instinct, but exhibits it in less pleasing ways. He is underhanded, wins by fraud or treachery, eggs on others to lick his enemy, curries favor by bribes, and is rightly an object of universal contempt. When he grows up he is timid, weak, solitary, narrow in sympathy. In his home he is a tyrant, in politics an ‘anti,’ in society a bore.”

That is the sort of thing you will find at every turn ; and even in this Conference I discover here and there traces of a lingering bloodthirstiness !

Now what can these feeble Mohonkers do? Is not the cause inadequate? Well, it is inadequate, if you call it a cause ; but Mohonk is an effect. It is an indication of the fact that God is working as He has never been able to work before in human society. God is ever on the lookout for instruments that agree with Him, and think as He does and feel as He does ; and when God one day discovered the Quakers He rejoiced as one that finds great spoil ; because here was something new in the earth — a society organized on the basis of friendship, of love, of kindliness. It was a novelty. God has been using that instrumentality since that day in spite of every conceivable obstacle, — these people that actually are simple-minded enough to take the Prince of Peace at his word ! [Applause.] Now it is because God is back of the Quaker principles that the Quaker principles are destined to become universal. There is no help for it ; it is bound to come, and it will come sooner than many of us suppose.

The time is not so distant when there will be such a thing in the earth as national magnanimity, and national generosity, and national meekness, and national pocketing of affronts. It is perfectly possible, and it will come, and war is to be a relic of the past, just as the waging of battle between individuals is to-day a relic of the distant past. Then that beautiful prayer of Edwin Markham will be fulfilled :

“ Cannons worn out with the work of hell,
That brief, abrupt persuasion of the shell ;
Let the shrewd spider lock them one by one,
With flimsy cables glistening in the sun ;
And let the throstle in their empty throats
Build his safe nest, and spill his rippling notes.”

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to honor that government and people who have made greater strides than any other government or people in the world in recent times in the development of civilization and good government. We are to hear next from the Consul-General of Japan, Mr. Uchida.

JAPAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ARBITRATION.

REMARKS OF MR. S. UCHIDA, CONSUL-GENERAL OF JAPAN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish I were allowed to make a speech in Japanese and one of you would interpret it for me. Then I could tire you out by prolonging it to any length. If there is any word which I say that you cannot understand, I wish you will take it for your fault instead of mine, because the tongue in which I am speaking now is yours and not my own. [Laughter.] But I will try my best to make your fault as little as possible by cutting my address as short as possible.

International disputes can be settled by one of three means,—diplomacy, arbitration or war. The last is the most barbarous, and it is certainly against the divine doctrines of Christianity. Yet even the most enlightened Christian nations cannot avoid war, and have to be prepared for deadly conflicts all the time by spending vast sums of money and withdrawing millions of able-bodied men from their peaceful pursuits. Why do they have to do this? Because all disputes between nations cannot be settled by diplomacy or arbitration alone under existing circumstances. Although arbitration is highly preferable to war, it would be impossible to dispense with war unless all nations of the world agreed to make arbitration the only and last means of settling international difficulties in case diplomacy fails.

What we need is a great federation of the entire world with a great central court to which all nations will submit all disputes between themselves and whose decision shall be enforced by the central authority through a standing army and navy especially organized for the purpose in case of necessity. Under this system international war can be made impossible, as different states in this country cannot fight each other over interstate difficulties, and armaments of individual nations could be reduced to such an extent as to enable each country to keep only a sufficient force for police duty within its own boundaries. Billions of money and millions of men which are now being used for armaments of different nations could be directed to the arts of peace, and the divine doctrine of "Peace on earth, goodwill to men," could then be realized.

Mr. Brown told us that war between Russia and Japan is inevitable. But we Japanese are trying our best to make it evitable. That is why we want an increase of the army and navy. We don't increase our army and navy in order to fight, but for the sake of

peace. Under the present circumstances the only way of avoiding war is to be prepared to fight, although that is the most expensive way of maintaining peace.

Japan does not want to fight and does not mean to fight, but she must keep up her fighting strength so long as she is going ahead as a nation which is trying to make herself respected by others. Give her a satisfactory assurance that she does not need any increase in her army and navy, and she will welcome the assurance and respect it.

The Conference then adjourned till 8 P. M.

Fourth Session.

Thursday Evening, May 28, 1903.

The Conference was called to order by the Chairman at 8 P.M., and the following was the program of the evening :

Introductory remarks by the Chairman, Hon. John W. Foster.

Report of Committee on Securing the Interest of Business Bodies, with address by Mr. Charles Richardson of Philadelphia.

Address by Mrs. May Wright Sewall, of Indianapolis, Chairman of the Committee on Peace and Arbitration of the International Council of Women.

Address on the Pious Fund Arbitration, by Hon. W. L. Penfield, Solicitor of the State Department, and United States Counsel in the Pious Fund Case.

Address by Mr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia.

Address by General A. C. Barnes (National Guard) of New York.

Address by Mr. Budgett Meakin of London, England, Director of the Shaftsbury Industrial Betterment Lectures of England.

On opening the session Mr. Foster spoke as follows on the

NEED OF SOMETHING BEYOND THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN W. FOSTER.

What I wanted to say was this: I am not satisfied with the Hague Treaty and the Hague Tribunal alone; I do not believe that they are going to accomplish all that we desire. First, for the reason that there is no provision for compulsory arbitration. The Hague Tribunal is organized, but it will not necessarily have any business; the only way in which it can have business is for the nations voluntarily to agree to come before it. Some of the nations will agree to go before it; the United States and Mexico have set a good example. But I doubt very much whether Germany would have been willing to send even such a little, insignificant case as the Venezuelan matter to the Hague Tribunal if our President had not declined to take charge of

that arbitration and advised the interested parties to go to The Hague. I shall be more encouraged about the efficacy of the Hague Tribunal when two great and powerful nations agree to refer an important question between themselves to it ; and that has not yet come to pass.

In my opening remarks I suggested that we discuss the question of the best means of influencing public sentiment in the United States in the direction of bringing about an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, and this evening I want to make a supplement to those remarks.

I am in favor of going a step farther than the Hague Treaty, which provides a tribunal for nations who choose to go to it ; I am in favor of pressing the subject before the American people until we can get the Senate of the United States to ratify a treaty which will compel the United States and Great Britain to settle their differences by arbitration. [Applause.] We have not reached that point yet, because the Senate of the United States declined to ratify a treaty that was signed six years ago, and it would probably hesitate to-day to ratify such a treaty. But such a treaty will stand a much better chance of ratification to-day than it did six years ago. We have made some advance in the direction of an arbitration treaty between these two great countries.

I recognize that there are limitations to arbitration. I referred to that in my opening remarks. All questions cannot to-day, and for some time in the future, be sent to arbitration. We want to get the Alaskan boundary question settled and remove it from the sphere of discussion between the United States and Great Britain ; it is a stumbling-block in the way of better relations. But it would have been an impossibility to have ratified a treaty referring that question to the Hague Tribunal, or to an arbitration tribunal organized by the United States and Great Britain. The people of our country were not willing to put in hazard any portion of the territory which they are convinced belongs to this country, and therefore it would have been unwise to make a treaty providing for arbitration on that question, because we could not have secured its ratification. The President and the Secretary of State have made the best disposition of that case that was possible, — and in politics possibilities have to be considered. It is wise for us not to attempt too much, even in a question like this.

I desire a treaty made between the United States and Great Britain by which the two countries will obligate themselves to refer all questions to arbitration of one kind or another. The treaty signed by Lord Pauncefote and Secretary Olney provided for just such a reference as the Alaskan Boundary Treaty has made ; that is, the organization of a mixed tribunal of three members on each side, and calling in no neutral arbitrator. Probably for the present that is the best we can do. I want such a treaty made between the United States and Great Britain ; I believe that such a treaty could be passed at the next Congress of the United States if this Conference would take

some step by which to rally the public sentiment of the country in favor of that measure.

If the United States and Great Britain agree upon a treaty, as Mr. Low said last night, it will be the first step, which will be soon followed by other nations. It will be easy then for the United States to make a treaty with France, and easier for France and Great Britain to make a treaty, — they have long tried to do it. It will be a long time before we can get all the nations of the earth that have united in the Hague Tribunal to agree to compulsory arbitration. That may not come in my day; I hope it will come in the day of some of these younger men here.

The Chairman then introduced Charles Richardson of Philadelphia, who gave the following

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECURING THE INTEREST OF BUSINESS BODIES.

REMARKS OF CHARLES RICHARDSON.

When the last annual Conference authorized the appointment of the committee whose report I am to present, it took a new step and a very practical step. The results of that step are not only very encouraging, but I think they indicate the importance of working on the same lines in a similar way during the coming year.

Mr. Richardson then read the following Report of the Committee on Securing the Interest of Business Bodies :

In pursuance of a resolution adopted by the Eighth Annual Conference on International Arbitration, Messrs. George Foster Peabody, Clinton Rogers Woodruff and Charles Richardson were appointed as a committee to prepare and issue a circular to business men.

In performing this duty it was thought best to emphasize the ruinous effects of war upon the purely business interests instead of enlarging upon the arguments which appeal to us more strongly from a moral and humanitarian standpoint. In order to add to the effectiveness of the circular, the committee prepared a letter to be sent to a number of leading business organizations in the United States, asking that their officials should recommend the circular for the careful consideration of their members. A copy of this letter and a copy of the circular, with a list of the endorsements procured, are submitted herewith. With a view to facilitate future work, the circular suggested that the business organizations should appoint committees which would be in touch with this Conference and have a discretionary authority to advocate international arbitration upon every suitable occasion.

The draft of the circular was submitted to Mr. Smiley and Dr. Trueblood and was approved by them before it was printed. About

ten thousand copies have been sent out, and about seven thousand of these have been distributed by the different associations.

A letter from our Secretary, Mr. H. C. Phillips, in reference to a further distribution and the printing of another edition, is presented as a part of this report.

The work of the committee has involved an extensive correspondence between its own members and between the Secretary and the various officers and influential members of business organizations throughout the country, and the time required has been greater than was originally anticipated. We believe, however, that it has been time well spent, and that it will bring forth good fruit in the development of public opinion.

On behalf of the Committee,

CHARLES RICHARDSON.

Continuing, Mr. Richardson said:

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to offer the suggestion on behalf of the committee to the Executive Committee, that for the continuance of the work another edition of the circular be printed, and that it be circulated as suggested by the Permanent Secretary. I would like also to suggest for the consideration of the Executive Committee whether it would be well to prepare a circular dealing with the subject more on the moral and humanitarian lines, to be sent as widely as possible to clergymen, with the idea of getting them to advocate international arbitration in the churches, in the Sunday schools and elsewhere whenever there is suitable occasion for it.

CIRCULAR TO BUSINESS MEN.

WHY BUSINESS MEN SHOULD PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

This circular is issued by direction of the Conference on International Arbitration held annually at Mohonk Lake, N. Y. It has been prepared by the undersigned special committee.

In view of the supreme importance of International Arbitration from the business man's standpoint, it is hoped that the business organizations of the United States will aid the committee by distributing copies of the circular to all their members.

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY,
CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF,
CHARLES RICHARDSON,

Special Committee.

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE, 1903.

President

Hon. John W. Foster, Washington, D. C.

*Secretaries*Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia, Pa.
H. C. Phillips, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.*Treasurer*

Alexander C. Wood, Camden, N. J.

BUSINESS COMMITTEE

John Crosby Brown, New York City, *Chairman*.

Hon. Alden Chester, Albany, N. Y.	Rev. Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, Providence, R.I.
Hon. John I. Gilbert, Malone, N. Y.	Hon. Frederick W. Holls, Yonkers, N. Y.
Mahlon N. Kline, Philadelphia, Pa.	Hon. M. P. Knowlton, Springfield, Mass.
Hon. H. B. F. MacFarland, Wash'n, D.C.	Virginus Newton, Richmond, Va.
Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston, Mass.	Hon. Wm. L. Penfield, Washington, D.C.
Daniel Smiley, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.	Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Boston, Mass.
Hon. Everett P. Wheeler, New York City.	Clinton R. Woodruff, Philadelphia, Pa.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

John B. Garrett, Rosemont, Pa., *Chairman*.

Edwin Ginn, Boston, Mass.	Hon. W. Martin Jones, Rochester, N. Y.
Charles Richardson, Philadelphia, Pa.	James Talcott, New York City.
Warner Van Norden, New York City.	

PRESS COMMITTEE

L. A. Maynard, New York City, *Chairman*.

H. L. Bridgman, Brooklyn, N. Y.	H. W. Horwill, New York City.
Charles E. Kelsey, Boston, Mass.	A. Maurice Low, Washington, D. C.
Bliss Perry, Boston, Mass.	Edward J. Wheeler, New York City.

AUDITING COMMITTEE

John B. Garrett, Rosemont, Pa.	Hon. Wm. J. Coombs, Brooklyn, N. Y.
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY BUSINESS MEN SHOULD PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

First.— Because the industrial, financial and commercial interests of all nations, and of all sellers, buyers and producers, are now so closely interwoven, and the prosperity of each is so dependent on the prosperity and on the producing or purchasing power of others, that the loss or injury of one must necessarily become to some extent the loss or injury of all.

Second.— Because peace and good will between the nations are essential for the prosperity of all, and war is as certain to result in disturbance and disaster for business interests as it is in suffering and death for the soldiers who face the horrors of the battlefield. Even the fear of war is sometimes sufficient to check the wheels of industry and commerce, to turn confidence into panic, and to increase greatly the risks and losses as well as the taxes and expenses of business men.

Third.— Because there are times when International Arbitration is the only means by which war can be avoided without submission to injustice or dishonor.

Fourth.— Because International Arbitration is a proved success and not a mere theory or experiment. As one of the many evidences of this it may be stated that in the last century nearly two hundred cases submitted by thirty-seven nations were settled by arbitration or joint high commissions, and sixty-three of these cases were submitted during the last decade. Since 1898 twenty-six nations, representing more than five-sixths of the territory and population of the globe, have united in establishing at The Hague a permanent court for the pacific settlement of all international disputes that may be submitted to it.

Fifth.— Because experience has shown that arbitration is not only a practically infallible means for preventing a war, but that it is also so effective in removing the desire for war and promoting friendship that there is no need for any form of coercion to enforce the decision. This is the natural result of a full presentation of both sides of the case, the carefully considered opinion of disinterested arbitrators, the modifying effect of time on human passions, and the knowledge that there can be no suspicion of weakness or timidity in accepting an adverse decision.

Sixth.— Because business men can do more than any others to convince the people that war should be classed with the duel and the old "trial by battle" as something too absurd, too wicked and too horrible to be tolerated; and that arbitration should be regarded by all men and all governments as a matter of course in every dispute that cannot be settled by friendly negotiations.

Seventh.— Because, if it should ever be possible to lighten the burdens of Industry and Commerce by checking the increase or securing a reduction in the great armies and navies of the world, it will only be when there shall have been such a general development of public opinion in favor of International Arbitration as a substitute for war that it will have become the settled policy of all the leading nations.

HOW BUSINESS MEN CAN PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

First.— By making use of favorable opportunities to discuss its advantages with others, and especially with editors, officials and men of influence in public affairs.

Second.— By having copies of this circular sent to all the members of their business associations with, if practicable, an official note or endorsement recommending its careful consideration.

Third.— By having in each business association a standing committee authorized to endorse and advocate International Arbitration on all suitable occasions, and to urge a reference to the Hague Court of every dispute that cannot be settled by diplomatic methods.

Fourth.— By providing that the addresses of such committees shall be sent to the Secretary of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, Mohonk Lake, N. Y., so that he can from time to time submit for their consideration such cases as may seem to call for special action.

The organizations declining to endorse the circular are three only: namely, the Chicago Board of Trade, the Chicago Union League Club, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. All give excellent reasons for refusing, and the officers express their individual approval of the movement. The latter organization says it intends to have a lecture before an open meeting this summer on the subject.

A number of organizations which have not formally endorsed the movement have taken copies of the circular for use in reading rooms, etc.

To date about ten thousand circulars have been disposed of to good advantage, the numbers indicated below being distributed through the courtesy of the various organizations. There will be no difficulty whatever in disposing of a further edition, brought up to date, including the recent additions (which are typewritten) to the list. In almost every instance, the officials, writing of the circular, take occasion to express their personal approval of the movement, and a large number express their willingness to coöperate in any way in their power.

The within circular has been recommended for the careful consideration of their members by the executive committees or officials of the following organizations :

Circulars
Distributed.

1000	The Merchants' Association	New York City
2000	*The Trades League	Philadelphia, Pa.
1000	The Chamber of Commerce	Boston, Mass.
50	The Merchants' Exchange	St. Louis, Mo.
200	The Chamber of Commerce	Baltimore, Md.
35	The Board of Trade	Baltimore, Md.
1300	The Merchants' Association	San Francisco, Cal.
	The Chamber of Commerce	San Francisco, Cal.
	The Board of Trade, Ltd.	New Orleans, La.
100	The Chamber of Commerce	Milwaukee, Wis.
200	The Commercial Club	Indianapolis, Ind.
500	*The Board of Trade	Little Rock, Ark.
	†The Merchants' Association	Boston, Mass.
	The Board of Trade	Kansas City, Mo.
	†The Board of Trade	Philadelphia, Pa.
500	The Business Men's League	St. Louis, Mo.
100	The Board of Trade	Wilmington, Del.
50	The Board of Trade	Jacksonville, Fla.

NOTE. — Since this circular appeared, endorsements have been received from
The Progressive Union New Orleans, La.
The Board of Trade Louisville, Ky.
The Chamber of Commerce Buffalo, N. Y.

* Organizations thus marked have appointed permanent committees on International Arbitration.

† These organizations are good for enough circulars for entire membership.

LETTER TO BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS ACCOMPANYING THE FOREGOING CIRCULAR.

*Lake Mohonk Conference
on International Arbitration.*

MOHONK LAKE, N. Y.

Dear Sir : In a separate enclosure mailed herewith you will find some copies of a preliminary circular on international arbitration which will explain itself. It is desired to issue a large edition, with the following additional statement or endorsement printed on each copy, namely :

“The within circular has been recommended for the careful consideration of their members by the executive committees or officials of the following organizations :”

.....
.....

It is not proposed to insert in such endorsement the names of more than a few of the leading business associations of the United States, and if you can take such action as will enable us to include the name of your organization in the list it will be a great service to a great cause.

Please address reply to H. C. Phillips, Secretary, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY,
CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF,
CHARLES RICHARDSON,
Committee of the Conference.

*Lake Mohonk Conference
on International Arbitration.*

MOHONK LAKE, N. Y., May 23, 1903.

Dear Mr. Richardson: I send you herewith a copy of the business circular bearing typewritten notes of progress. The endorsements continue to come in from time to time, and, undoubtedly, by stirring up the matter a little later, a few more could be added.

It seems to me that instead of being completed this movement is but well begun, and that it would be well to have at least one more edition printed bearing the later endorsements. This complete edition could be widely circulated, not only to business men and firms, but to the press. I have tried to do very little in the press line, thinking that the second edition, with the larger number of endorsers, would be more acceptable to newspapers.

I trust the enclosed notes will furnish you good material for your report as Chairman of last year's committee, and I should be glad to see the movement continued.

Very truly yours,

H. C. PHILLIPS,
Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: This report will be referred to the Business Committee, who will doubtless report upon it before we adjourn.

We are now to hear from one of the best known ladies in the country in the great work of moulding public sentiment in the right direction, Mrs. May Wright Sewall of Indianapolis.

THE UNIVERSAL DEMONSTRATION OF WOMEN IN BEHALF OF ARBITRATION AND PEACE.

ADDRESS OF MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mohonk Conference: Although not the first time that our kind host has graciously remembered me in extending his invitations, it is the first time that it has been possible for me to accept. I feel it a great privilege to bring before you the particular phase of the work in behalf of international arbitration which I have the honor to represent.

It has seemed to me that one of the chief obstacles in this cause is, that the different lines of work are so divergent and that their leaders are distinguished by such a large degree of mutual unintelligence. I feel that if coming to Mohonk should bring to the knowledge of many in larger degree the work of each, that alone would be almost sufficient reward for the great hospitality which is shown this still greater movement.

It is the work of the International Council of Women in behalf of this cause for which I wish to speak, and particularly that phase of it which is known as the Universal Demonstration of Women in behalf of Social Peace and International Arbitration. We recognize the fact that social peace and international arbitration are of the same fibre; that the fibre of both comes out of the heart of God; that woof

and warp can be supplied only from that source which is our origin, and only as we recognize ourselves as made of the fibre of God.

Hardly had the Rescript of the Czar been favorably considered by the peoples before a movement was set on foot by the women of Germany to call the women of the world to make a universal or world demonstration in cordial recognition of the Czar's work for the preservation of the home. The first demonstration was made on May 15, 1899. In this demonstration the women of twenty-five countries participated, and in our own country two hundred and forty meetings were held simultaneously, that is, on the same afternoon, between 2 and 8 o'clock on the 15th of May. The fact that these meetings were held, and that a resolution of grateful appreciation of the Czar's action was passed at them, was cabled to the central bureau at The Hague; and the reports thus sent by cable were gathered up and presented in a report of the women of the world to the Czar and to the Congress through Baron de Staal, who respectfully received and read the resolutions that had been passed.

The next demonstration was held the next year between the 11th and the 18th of May on dates convenient in the different localities, and held, as you will remember, when the very memory of the Hague Conference was likely to be drowned in the boom of cannon from battlefields made possible by the two great powers that had apparently forgotten their signing of the Hague Convention.

The next demonstration was in 1901, under happier circumstances, because the end of those wars seemed in sight. In 1902 we were able to hold our demonstration no longer merely as a memorial to the Czar's Conference, which had crystallized the new hope for the world, but we were able to celebrate the organization of the International Court of Arbitration, which seemed the visible core of that permanent Parliament of the Nations which shall prove that such a body was not merely a poet's dream, but a fact in the heart of God before the foundations of the earth were laid.

The next and the last demonstration has just been held, on the 18th of May this year, and the reports in their entirety are not yet in. I must therefore go back to the report of 1902, as I have been asked to confine myself to historical statement to-night. In 1902, in our own country, the number of meetings held simultaneously was three hundred and twenty-three. Nearly ten thousand people were present at the three hundred and twenty-three meetings, and over six hundred people took part in speaking or in invoking the divine blessing or in song. Now what do we do in these demonstrations? Exactly what we pledged ourselves to the Hague Conference in July of 1899 we would do. The second quinquennial session of the International Council of Women was in session at London during the time that the Conference of the Czar was in session at The Hague, and at the last public meeting held under the auspices of the International Council it was voted unanimously, by the nine national councils of women which at that time composed the International Council, that propaganda in behalf of the work of the Hague Conference

should be the chief business of the International Council. We appeal — knowing that of course our function is the creation and direction of public sentiment — to those who ought to be, and who by their offices naturally are, the guides and teachers of the race. We said that our appeal should be directed to the home, to the church and to the school; that we should appeal to the home through the women who have the first touch upon the child's brain, to the school through the teachers who have perhaps the second, and to the church through the clergy.

We have, of course, had our disheartening experiences in connection with all three. For many a woman, — feeling all the pain that can be felt at the consciousness, the recollection, that every soldier is provided at the cost of some woman, — many a woman hardly dares, because of the false teaching that we have in respect to what constitutes patriotism, teach her child that there is a higher patriotism than that manifested on the battlefield. It is difficult to appeal to the school through the teacher when the schools are doing all that they can to revive the military spirit which long ago we hoped had fled, and to increase that spirit by the organization of military bodies in the public and private schools alike, by the transformation of athletic training, the modification of the work of the gymnasium, the field of sports, and the playground by the military method.

We have found the same difficulty even with the clergy. At the demonstration three years ago when we sent out our annual letter to the clergymen throughout the country, appealing to them to speak on the International Court of Arbitration on the first Sunday in May, many of them replied that war was just as necessary to the work of the clergy as it was to the work of any other section of human society, that the musket was the inevitable predecessor of the missionary.

We are glad, however, to observe a changed spirit on the part of the clergy, a proof of which in my own city of Indianapolis I am sure our presiding officer will allow me to cite. It has been our custom to send every year a delegate to the Ministerial Association with the request that the clergy speak on behalf of international arbitration and expound it, because our people are densely ignorant in regard to the historic facts in connection with it. We found in past years that our clergymen would only pass a resolution of sympathetic approval of the public-spirited work of their own townswomen. That is simply the most polite form in which contempt has learned to couch itself. But this year the same Ministerial Association voted the resolution we had wished passed; they also voted the appointment of a coöperating committee, and actually appointed a committee of clergymen representing three branches of the Protestant Christian faith, who came before us with an offer to serve in any way possible. Of the clergymen in our city, more than seventy-five per cent. preached or prayed or read concerning the International Court of Arbitration on either the first or second Sunday of May. On the day on which our demonstration was held, the 18th of May, as presiding officer of the meeting, I had the pleasure of

presenting a Catholic priest for the invocation, a clergyman of the "Christian" faith, for an address representative of the Ministerial Association, and the Rabbi of our chief Jewish synagogue to pronounce the benediction. This shows that in our own community the clergy are taking an altogether more religious attitude than that which they had taken before.

Now what do we hope to accomplish, and by what method? As I have said, we appeal to the home through the women who reign over it; to the school through the teachers who are its guides and instructors; and to the people at large through the clergy, who should be their spiritual inspiration and their guides and instructors as well.

But the one thing which we know must be done in order that the International Court of Arbitration may be made practical, in order that we may see accomplished what our Chairman so well says is the next step and the necessary step toward making it of value, making compulsory upon the nations the bringing before it of their differences,—we know that the first step toward that is the abandonment of national arrogance, and the substitution therefor of a rational, high-minded patriotism. We need a patriotism which shall recognize that the democracy which we have been so proud to establish between man and man in our own country is equally applicable to nations. Before the Court of International Arbitration shall be practical and helpful, there must be a democracy of feeling among the nations of the world. It must not be any more possible for a nation to take all the virtues to itself and ascribe all the ignorance to the Latin races or to the Asiatic races than it is possible within a republic for an individual to assume for himself any virtue to which the humblest member of the commonwealth may not aspire. We need that kind of patriotism which shall be neither arrogance nor a maudlin sentimentalism, but which shall be a love of one's country larger than the love for one's self, because in one's country one is multiplied by many millions, because in the aggregate man one sees a larger reflection of the image of the creative God. We need that kind of patriotism for which in seventeen different countries seven millions of women in the International Council stand.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to have had the honor to present the first case to the Hague Tribunal. There is a gentleman here tonight who had that honor, and upon our invitation he has left his important duties at Washington to come and tell us about the Pious Fund Case, which was the first case presented to that Tribunal, Hon. William L. Penfield, Solicitor of the State Department.

THE HAGUE COURT IN THE PIOUS FUND ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF HON. W. L. PENFIELD.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am to speak on the subject of the Hague Court in connection with the Pious Fund Arbitration. It is expected that I shall give some account of the Court in action, some account of its proceedings, and some reckoning of the results which were achieved by that arbitration.

As you will already perceive, my statement will be of the dry-as-dust order; that is to say, a statement in a lawyer-like fashion of the bare facts as I am able to present them. Therefore I feel that I have a right to crave the indulgent consideration of this magnificent audience.

In a court room of modest size and modestly furnished, on the 15th day of last September, the first Court of Permanent Arbitration was declared open by the presiding arbitrator. On an elevated platform was ranged the tribunal; before them were the court staff, the counsel of the adverse parties, and a numerous assemblage of diplomatic representatives from Asiatic, European and American states; while looking down from the walls on the solemn scene about to be enacted were the images of the rulers of states, signatories of the Hague Convention. The thought uppermost in all minds was, that here at last was on trial the question of the peace of nations. A prodigious interest was manifested in the proceedings, for the decision to be rendered would be flashed across the seas from The Hague to the banks of the Potomac and the City of Mexico, and its echoes would be heard in the most distant courts. It was an impressive spectacle, a marvelous fulfillment of the prophecy uttered when the Peace Congress of Paris was opened a half-century ago: "A day will come when bullets and bombs will be replaced by the venerable arbitration of a great sovereign senate."

The case on trial was known as the "Pious Fund of the Californias." It originated in donations made by Spanish subjects during the latter part of the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth centuries for the spread of the Roman Catholic faith in the Californias. These gifts, amounting approximately to \$1,700,000, were made in trust to the Society of Jesus for the execution of the pious wish of the founders. The Jesuits accepted the trust and discharged its duties until they were disabled from its further administration by their expulsion in 1767 from the Spanish dominions by the King of Spain and by the suppression of the order by the Pope in 1773. The Crown of Spain took possession of and administered the trust for the uses declared by the donors until Mexico, after her independence was achieved, succeeded to the administration of the trust. Finally, in 1842, President Santa Anna ordered the properties to be sold, that the proceeds thereof be incorporated into the national

treasury, and that six per cent. annual interest on the capitalization of the property should be paid and devoted to the carrying out of the intention of the donors in the conversion and civilization of the savages.

Upper California having been ceded to the United States in 1848 by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Mexican government refused to pay to the prelates of the Church in Upper California any share of the interest which accrued after the ratification of the treaty. The latter presented their claims therefor to the Department of State and requested the interposition of the government. A mixed commission for the settlement of the cross claims between the two governments was formed under the convention of July 4, 1869. On the presentation and hearing of the claim the United States and Mexican commissioners divided in opinion. The case was accordingly referred to the umpire, Sir Edward Thornton, who rendered an award in favor of the United States for twenty-one annuities of \$43,050.99 each as the equitable proportion to which the prelates of Upper California were entitled of the interest accrued on the entire fund from the making of the treaty of peace down to February 2, 1869. The Mexican government paid the award, but, asserting that the claim was extinguished, refused to make any further payments of interest for the benefit of the Church in Upper California. Again the prelates appealed to the Department of State for support, and in 1898 active diplomatic discussions between the two governments as to the merits of the claim were begun and carried forward until they culminated in a formal agreement to refer the case to the determination of the Hague Tribunal. Only two issues were presented by the protocol, namely:

1. Is the case, as a consequence of the decision of Sir Edward Thornton, within the governing principle of *res judicata*?
2. If not, is the claim just?

And the Court was authorized to render whatever judgment might be found just and equitable.

After the protocol was signed, it was necessary under its terms for each government to select two arbitrators, who were, in turn, to select the fifth or presiding arbitrator.

Precisely as the lawyer scans the jury before he accepts the panel which is to try his case, the Department of State set on foot, through diplomatic channels, careful inquiries into the qualifications of the various members who constitute the permanent panel from which the trial court is selected. Four Asiatic, twenty European, and two American states are signatories of the Hague Convention. Each of these states is authorized to select not exceeding four persons as members of the permanent panel. The total number appointed is sixty-eight. Inquiries were made and information was gathered touching the particular qualifications of these men, their experience — judicial, diplomatic, and political — and their writings and opinions on international and political subjects.

The United States selected Professor Martens of Russia and Sir Edward Fry of England; Mexico selected Dr. Asser and Mr. Savorin-Lohman, both of the Netherlands; and they chose as presiding

arbitrator Dr. Matzen of Denmark, — all being members of the permanent panel.

I will not enlarge in description of the personnel of the Court. Their impartiality, ability and learning were evinced by the judgment rendered, as well as by the dignity and decorum of the proceedings, in keeping with the character of the Tribunal. It is a singular fact that this case, which was presented by the United States on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church against a state in which the Roman Catholic is the predominant religion, was decided by a court composed of five judges, all of the Protestant faith.

Already, before the Court had formally convened, the preliminary briefs, or statements, and the evidence on either side, had been prepared and submitted to the arbitrators.

In declaring the Court opened, the president expressed the hope that they might inaugurate the labors of arbitration tribunals under the Hague Convention in a manner responsive to the thought which inspired its creation and the aim which it was called upon to facilitate, namely, the settlement of disputes between states upon the only solid basis, the basis of respect for law.

The first order of the Court announced by the president was that the language of the Tribunal would be French, saving to the parties the right to speak also in English, and that the debates would be public.

The next order of the Court was on a point of procedure respecting the submission of certain written pleadings. The next rule respected the order of oral arguments, under which the United States was to open, Mexico to answer, the United States to reply, and Mexico to rejoin.

Excluding days of recess, the arguments occupied ten days. On October 1 the president declared the closure of the debates, that the Tribunal would deliberate upon the matter in litigation, and that the sentence would be read in a public session, of which the agents and counsel of the two governments would be duly notified.

The Court reconvened accordingly, after due notice, on October 14, and the president read the opinion. It awarded to the United States the sum of \$1,420,082.67 in gross, and a perpetual annuity of \$43,050.99, payable in the legal currency of Mexico. The judgment was unquestionably sound, and received the prompt acceptance of both states.

Considering the magnitude of the cause and the historic nature of the evidence and issues involved, the brevity of the trial was extraordinary. But no trial can be too short which is ample for the ends of justice. To terminate the controversy as soon as possible in the due course of justice, to hasten the restoration of those relations of amity which may have been strained or interrupted between the states at variance, and at the same time to exalt the character and reputation of the Tribunal for ability, impartiality, rectitude and justice, were among the chief aims of its institution.

It was with not a little surprise that the appearance was observed

of members of the permanent panel as advocates before the Court. It is unnecessary to dwell on certain incidents that occurred during the progress of the trial. It is enough to say that the appearance in successive trials in the same court of the same gentlemen acting alternately as advocates and judges is fraught with snares, as it is inconsistent with American ideals of judicial justice.

At the Hague Conference Lord Pauncefote foresaw the peril. He vainly sought to avert it by a provision of the Convention. He declared for the wholesome rule which would disqualify members of the Permanent Court from practising before the Court. But public opinion can prohibit even where the organic law is silent. To the judges of the Supreme Court we would not permit the practice; and the reason of the maxim, "Once a judge always a judge," is of infinite pith and moment in its application to the Hague Court, where such mighty interests are at stake.

Still other perils lie before the Hague Tribunal. It is strange, but nevertheless true, that one of these perils arises out of the depth of interest created by the Pious Fund Arbitration. The case has been the subject of Presidential messages to the United States and the Mexican Congresses; was the occasion of an interpellation of the government in the French Legislative Chamber, of mention in other parliamentary bodies and in the diplomatic correspondence of many states, and of extensive discussion in the American and the European press. The depth of interest and feeling excited is not without danger of producing internal dissensions among the ardent friends of the cause. Time, patience, forbearance and reasonableness are needful to solve the problem, as it must be worked out, if at all, along practical lines. But, with abiding faith in the skillful hand that guides and guards our foreign relations, we need not fear that the cause which the Hague Court represents will fail miserably, as the new Union of the States under the Constitution, when threatened with dissensions, did not fail at the hands of its friends, who shared in bringing it into being and setting it on its course.

At this point Mr. Penfield laid aside his manuscript and said :

I beg to differ, therefore, in opinion from one of the speakers, who said in substance that no analogy could be drawn between the public action and influence of the Hague Court and that of the Supreme Court of the United States. Constitutions and laws are but parchment unless they are informed with moral sentiment and with ties of political and commercial interest. It was that sentiment and those ties that saved the Constitution, and that established the Supreme Court of the United States finally as the permanent arbitrator between the states of the Union; and the same sentiment and the same ties, political and commercial, will establish the Hague Court finally as the accepted permanent arbitrator in disputes between nations.

Mr. Penfield then resumed reading as follows :

It goes without saying that in the trial of any lawsuit the judge should be as far removed as possible from any motive, interest, or influence which might even unconsciously warp his judgment. There were two safeguards of judicial impartiality in the Pious Fund Case. In the first place, a panel of sixty-eight publicists and jurists was at hand to choose from. They had been selected each by the ruler of his own state ; they had been selected as the justices of the Supreme Court are appointed, not with reference to any particular controversy, but because of their supposed fitness for the arbitral function.

No man can be truly a judge in his own cause. Consequently, it was stipulated in the protocol that none of the arbitrators should be a native or citizen of the contracting states. The result justified the experiment, by the freedom, during the progress of the trial, from manifestation of judicial bias or partisan feeling, and by the award unanimously given. Judging from experience and from the conflicting attitudes of the two governments with respect to the questions of liability and of the currency in which the award should be payable, it is probable that, if the contracting states had each selected one of its own citizens as arbitrator, there would have been three opinions rendered, a majority opinion and two dissenting opinions, one by the Mexican arbitrator on the question of liability and one by the American arbitrator on the question of the currency in which the award should be paid.

On May 7, 1903, protocols were signed for the submission to the Hague Tribunal of a question in which eight European and three American states are concerned. The usual course would have been for each party to the arbitration to name one or more of its own citizens or subjects as a part of the Tribunal, and we should, perhaps, have witnessed dissensions which in the past have distracted the deliberations of tribunals so constituted. What more convincing evidence of the wisdom of the precedent set by the United States and Mexico than the stipulation of the protocols, recently signed, that none of the arbitrators shall be a citizen or subject of any of the signatory or creditor powers ?

I have stated the nature of the issues and the manner in which they were formed between the parties. It will be observed that the issues submitted by the arbitrating states to the Hague Court were joined and tried in essentially the same manner as the issues in lawsuits before the municipal courts.

There is, first, the transaction which begets the controversy. This results in conflicting contentions and arguments between the parties until the ultimate issues of law and fact are evolved and reduced to written form. Then the case is brought before the appointed court, to whom the statements of the case and the evidence on either side are submitted. On the hearing, the one having the affirmative opens and is followed by the adversary. The court holds stated sessions, decides incidental questions of procedure, finally declares the

hearings closed, then deliberates and renders solemn judgment. In short, the principles of judicial procedure are essentially the same, whether before the Roman praetor, the civil courts of Germany, France, Italy, Spain or South America, or before the English or American judge or magistrate, or the supreme court of the state, or the supreme court of nations.

On July 29, 1899, the Hague Convention had been signed. Nearly three years had elapsed, and yet of the twenty-six contracting states no one had moved the reference of any of their numerous controversies to arbitration under the Convention. We were losing time. No opportunity was to be lost to charge the Court with the active exercise of its functions in order that it might show forth its usefulness.

When diplomatic discussion of the Pious Fund Case had reached the stage of irreconcilable disagreement between the two governments, namely, on March 13, 1902, the Secretary of State instructed Ambassador Clayton to say to the Mexican government that "the President feels that it would especially redound to the credit of the United States and of Mexico if the two North American Republics might be the first states to submit to the Hague Tribunal, for determination by it, an international controversy. The department has no doubt that President Diaz would share in the pleasure which all Americans would feel in the high example thus set by two of the leading republics of this hemisphere. You will, in the exercise of your discretion, bring the matter to the attention of the Mexican government, in order that if the suggestion is favorably received one of the principal advantages of the arbitration may not be lost by a possible prior reference of some other case to that tribunal."

Within about two months thereafter, namely, on the twenty-second day of May, the protocol for the submission of the case to the Hague Tribunal was signed by the Secretary of State and the Mexican ambassador.

The Pious Fund arbitration came none too soon. One of the arbitrators said that one day he was talking with a friend about the Permanent Court and expressed the opinion, not then uncommon in Europe, that the Court would never be called to hear a case. One week from that day he received his appointment as arbitrator.

What gains, then, do we count from the Pious Fund arbitration?

First: Saving the Hague Court from perishing by neglect.

Second: The precedent of the submission of the case to absolutely disinterested arbitrators.

Third: The example of the actual workings of the Tribunal.

Fourth: The authoritative establishment of the principle of public law that issues once fairly tried and determined between arbitrating states are settled forever.

Fifth: The example set by two republics of the New World witnessing, foremost among nations, their faith in the Hague Tribunal.

Sixth: Let us now make our final reckoning. With the five powerful, vital monarchies, Japan, Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary and

Italy, we balance the six great, vital republics, France, the United States, Mexico, Brazil, Chile and the Argentine Republic, and the democracy of the British empire. They all stand committed by policy, and the most of them by faith, to the principle of arbitration. The Hague Court will, then, stand, and will grow in usefulness and power. It will in large measure be to international politics what the Supreme Court is to the domestic politics of the United States in the settlement of disputes between states. It will be the organ of the enlightened will and conscience of the world's democracy.

The United States government presses no claim against any government which it does not believe to be just and which it is not willing to arbitrate. If evidence of this fact were needed, it is at hand. During the last six years this government has brought to issue eighteen cases against foreign governments. Of these, five have been submitted to mixed commissions and thirteen to arbitration. Of this number, five are still pending; namely, the cases before the Joint High Canadian Commission, the Alaskan Boundary Commission, the Venezuelan Commission, an arbitration with Santo Domingo, and the Hague arbitration of next September. Of the other thirteen, one was the case before the Chilean Claims Commission; and of the twelve arbitrations, one minor case was decided against the United States; another in which the United States and the British governments were held liable to the German government for naval operations in Samoa; and ten were decided in favor of the United States, with awards amounting to upwards of \$2,500,000. One case was brought to issue and the arbitrator appointed, and on the final submission in full of the claimant's evidence to the Department of State, the case was withdrawn on the ground that it appeared to be wanting in substantial justice. During this period \$1,130,506.55 has been returned to the Mexican government which had been collected on awards rendered on fabricated evidence. Thus, when tried by either test, the success which has attended the enforcement of its just claims by arbitration, or the refusal to press an unjust case and the refundment of moneys unjustly collected, we have a right to be proud of the record of our government, proud of the justice and magnanimity of our country.

When we reflect that the United States government has been a party to sixty-eight commissions and arbitrations in all; that it has been a party to one-fourth of these during the last six years; that in the span of a lifetime the United States has won acknowledged leadership among the nations in the one cause in which all states and all peoples are most deeply concerned, we are heartened with increased hope in the ultimate triumph of international justice and with fresh inspiration to strengthen in us our faith in the self-governing democracy.

Recently its powerful influence has again been cast into the scales in favor of international arbitration; and on the first day of next September, it will appear the second time and in the second case to be heard before that Tribunal, where will be arrayed on one side three European states and on the other five European and three

American states. How marvelous and inspiring is the contrast between the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the star of Napoleon fell at Leipzig in the shock of the battle of nations, and the dawn of the twentieth century, when the morning star of peace rises at The Hague over eleven states yielding homage to a common law in the arbitration of nations !

THE CHAIRMAN : I feel that I speak the sentiments of Mr. Smiley and of all the members of this Conference in thanking Judge Penfield for coming to us and giving us this intelligent and enlightening address. [Applause.]

The Chairman then introduced Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia, who spoke on

THE CONTRIBUTION WHICH LAWYERS ARE MAKING TO THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

ADDRESS OF CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen : There was a remark made by the Japanese Consul this morning that I am sure must have impressed each of us. He spoke of the three methods of settling international disputes : first, by diplomacy ; second, by arbitration ; third, by war. In considering this question of international arbitration, we must not conclude that because we have a permanent international tribunal at The Hague it does away with the first-named method of settling international disputes ; on the contrary, we must do all that we can to promote the settlement of disputes through diplomatic channels. Those of us who have read that remarkable address of Secretary Hay at the Chamber of Commerce dinner in New York on "The New Diplomacy," will recognize what a great power diplomacy can be made in the settlement of international disputes. Progress lies in the direction of increasing the number of cases that are settled first by diplomacy and then by international arbitration, and by decreasing the class of cases heretofore considered necessary to be settled by war.

The practice of the law is tending rapidly toward the settlement of cases outside of the courts. The most successful lawyers are those who dispose of the most cases in this way. Some of the most successful lawyers in my own city are those who scarcely ever appear in the courts at all. I believe that the settlement of international disputes will be in precisely the same direction — the settlement of cases largely outside of the Tribunal at The Hague. In other words, the thing to do in these days is to get at the justice of the case.

We have heard a great deal in these meetings of the influence of the ministers and of the influence of the press, but I believe that the

lawyers are doing quite as much, if not in some instances more than either the press or the pulpit, in the creation of a profound public sentiment in behalf of international arbitration.

I want to make this statement, startling though it may appear, that the progress of civilization has kept step with the increase in the number of lawyers. If you analyze that statement you will see that it is true: that as civilization has progressed, the idea of settling disputes between men and between parties without the use of force has grown, and that this has brought into the field of activity larger and larger numbers of lawyers. Lawyers now-a-days are something more than the successful managers of litigation; they are men who are called upon to arbitrate differences between conflicting interests. Our greatest lawyers are those engaged in the management of great interests, in the avoidance of litigation, and in the settlement of disputed points without the reference to a court.

So it is going to be in the settlement of international controversies. It is also a remarkable fact that the soldier is either himself becoming an arbitrator or is being succeeded by the international lawyer in the settlement of disputes. We heard this morning the testimony that Dr. Abbott cited from the case of Porto Rico. I am sure that could be duplicated by other nations — that the soldiers are to all intents and purposes becoming frequently the machinery by which there is worked out a pacific settlement of the questions which have heretofore needed the arbitrament of a court and jury, or possibly that of arms.

In the second place, I believe that lawyers make for international arbitration quite as much as the ministers and the press, because they are constantly teaching what Dr. Moxom pointed out as being one of the essential things which we must bear in mind, namely, obedience to law. We cannot call upon nations to obey law unless we have respect for it in our national and state relations, and we cannot have obedience in these unless we have respect for law in our private relations.

I was glad to hear — and I am sure everyone here was pleased to find — that the women had with rare instinct tied the two ideas together, social peace and international arbitration. You cannot have international arbitration and peace unless you have social peace; you cannot have such an acquiescence in law in international matters as we have heard of in these various addresses, unless the people within the nations are trained to respect the law and to obey it. And as the American people become more and more accustomed to acquiesce in the law, so it will be easier for them to acquiesce in the decision of courts in international disputes.

A few hundred years ago there was a certain amount of acquiescence in the law; but it did not unfrequently happen that if those who were parties to the litigation did not like it they would defy the court. How different now! In the last two or three years we have had the settlement of the insular cases involving millions of lives and a great territory. When the Supreme Court decided these cases

there was an immediate acquiescence, on the part of every one, in the judgment of the Court, notwithstanding the fact that it was determined by a single vote, the vote being five to four. This was a magnificent illustration of the growth of the American people in obedience to law.*

Gen. A. C. Barnes of the National Guard was next introduced, and spoke on

THE DANGER FROM SOCIAL UNREST AT HOME.

ADDRESS OF GEN. A. C. BARNES.

Mr. Chairman and Gentle Friends of Peace: A certain well-known humorist boasts that he is the only totally consistent total abstinence man, because he totally abstains from abstaining; and some of us earnest Peace people are unflinchingly determined that universal peace shall prevail, even if we have to fight for it.

It seems strange, does it not, that one who is even nominally a warrior should advocate the things that make for peace? Perhaps a National Guardsman, who is only an amateur, looks at these things differently from a regular or professional soldier; but a sense of duty, and not an altogether agreeable duty, is behind our service. The responsibility is great, the emoluments invisible. We sometimes ask ourselves why we bear arms. There is a fascination about it quite apart from bloodshedding, I assure you. When we reason about the matter at all we reach the conclusion that we exist to prevent war, and not to carry it on, unless we have to. There is no eagerness on our part to wallow in gore, or even to make a violent departure from this pleasant earth, although a clever writer has recently put into the mouth of his hero these astounding words: "I wish to die a fierce death; it is best to die in battle, because then the mind is raised and you taste the whole of life in the moment before you go." Now I may be mistaken, but I think soldiers of all classes will agree with me that this is rank nonsense. On the contrary, each one of us desires, when our time comes, to die in a good old bed, surrounded by loving friends, with a kind physician to soothe our pains and a good pastor to commend our souls to heaven. Equally with you, the sincere and earnest friends of peace, we pray to be delivered from the horrors of war, and the more fervently because it means so much more to us than to you.

* Since the delivery of the above remarks, I have come across the following in an address on the "Practice of the Criminal Law," delivered by the Hon. Mayer Sulzberger, President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, No. 29, Philadelphia, to the students of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania:

"Law is peace. The practice of the law is a continuous battle for peace. That the conflicting interests of mankind shall not be adjusted primarily by force, and secondarily by that modified force called fraud, is the mission of the law, and whatever conflicts impend it behooves the professors of that science to stand true to their mission. Fearless and unafraid, they must proclaim and defend the doctrine that all legal adjustments must be based upon moral right, and that every apparent triumph of force, however great, or of fraud, however subtle, must in the end crumble before the august majesty of the state whose principle is 'justice.'"

C. R. W.

Benjamin Franklin, in his "Autobiography," relates an instance to illustrate the willingness of non-combatants that war should be waged in their interest, and a not invincible repugnance to take part in it themselves. The good ship which brought Mr. Smiley's great ancestor, William Penn, to this country, was chased by a hostile vessel, and the captain, preparing for defence, cleared his deck for action and told Mr. Penn and his company of Friends that they might retire to the cabin. They all did so except one, Penn's secretary, James Logan by name, who chose to remain upon the deck and was assigned to a gun. As it turned out, the hostile vessel was out-sailed, so there was no fighting, but when Logan went below to report he received a severe rebuke for his warlike conduct, the same being contrary to the principles of Friends. But Logan responded in a spirited manner: "As I am thy servant, why didst thou not order me to come down? But thou wast willing enough that I should stay and help fight the ship when thou thoughtest there was danger." Franklin also tells how the early assembly of Pennsylvania managed to vote warlike supplies without offending conscience. This was done by voting money for the public use and never inquiring how it was expended. When gunpowder was needed they appropriated three thousand dollars for the purchase of rye, wheat, and "other grains;" and a resolution to obtain a new "fire engine" for the city of Philadelphia resulted in the acquisition of a big cannon, which was certainly within the letter and undoubtedly fulfilled the spirit of the resolution.

With the growth of this wonderful country of ours, and its vast resources in men and material, the era of possible foreign war for us seems to have passed. I wonder if you realize that in case of necessity ten million sturdy men could be placed in the field, and we could equip, feed, and transport them all. Who would care to encounter such a mighty host marching under the sacred banner of liberty?

One condition exists, however, which might embroil us but for the reluctance of the powers to affront the great republic; this has been several times referred to in the course of the Conference. I refer to the virtual protectorate established by us over the South American States. For a weaker nation this would be a perilous attitude. Our right to dictate on this subject has never been acknowledged, and only a few years ago was openly ridiculed. But the Spanish War, if it served no other good purpose, has changed all that. An intimation that the Monroe Doctrine would be enforced in Venezuela brought Germany and Great Britain, with a hollow smile upon their faces, right up to the open door of Arbitration, and ushered them gracefully into that Temple of Equity which you, my friends, have done so much to establish. So you see that embattled might may be as useful to a good cause as was Christian's escort, Great Heart, in the "Pilgrim's Progress."

But our real national danger lies right here at home, caused by social unrest. The earth trembles, and it seems to me at times that

the foundations of the republic are threatened; it is the workingman endeavoring to improve his condition by force. Your great principle of arbitration alone can control and measurably satisfy him. But your attention does not seem to have been called particularly to this application of it. It is very well to step between frowning nations and read to them the Riot Act from some international code. Meantime a lurking foe beneath your own doorstep may set the house on fire while you are absent on extraneous errands of mercy. A vigilant guard of which I have the honor to be a member, is on duty for temporary protection, but the iron hand of Suppression should only be laid on long enough to allow the Mills of Justice time to grind.

It is true that industrial arbitration has already accomplished something parallel with your own successes. Witness the great labor strike among the coal mines of Pennsylvania, which caused so much distress throughout the whole country during the last year. Relief was slow, but happily no serious conflict of arms occurred, though there were frightful possibilities in the situation. Thousands of miners, inflamed by the worst passions of ignorant and brutal men, were confronted by a few regiments of determined, well-armed National Guardsmen. The logic of physical power the insurgents could understand and did respect. So they were held in check until the Commission appointed by the President and accepted by both parties had time to enter upon its work and solve the problems that must otherwise have disentangled themselves through many a bloody scene.

Now we have not yet seen the end of trouble of this sort. The land is rife with it from end to end. Labor is alert and vindictive; capital is arrogant and unyielding. If you cannot see your way clear to work for some systematic method of dealing with strikes by arbitration, then some other conference should take the matter in hand as one of the living and most important questions of the hour.

It seems to me, though I do not profess to be a lawyer or to be acquainted with all the intricacies of such a question, that compulsory arbitration, incorporated judiciously with the organic law, but independent of the consent of the parties in the first instance, operating automatically, so to speak, is the obvious remedy for industrial and social strife. Our Congress—our very busy Congress—as usual waits for some outside pressure to initiate the necessary legislation. Who could supply such pressure more effectively than the trained and earnest minds in which humanity is so ripe and experience so fertile of methods, that distant nations, almost unconscious of the source of influence which sways them, pay tribute by their acts to the Lake Mohonk Conference and to that gentle, modest leader who more than any other among modern men wears the tiara of the prince of peace! His be the name and fame of that most pacific of Roman emperors, Numa Pompilius, in whose reign the gates of the Temple of Janus were closed for two-

score years, while the happy people went chanting through the streets of the Imperial city :

“Over the iron shield the spiders spin their threads;
Rust eats the pointed spear and double-edged sword.
Not now is heard the brazen trumpet’s roar;
Sweet sleep is banished from our eyes no more.”

THE CHAIRMAN : We have present with us a kinsman from across the sea, who is here studying our social problems. I am sorry that we have to call on him so late, but we shall all be glad to hear from Mr. Budgett Meakin of London, England.

THE ATTITUDE WHICH GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES OUGHT TO BEAR TOWARD EACH OTHER.

REMARKS OF MR. BUDGETT MEAKIN.

Early this evening a note was struck which I would like most heartily to endorse; that was a suggestion that it lies with England and America to set the example to the world of making up their minds that every difficulty between them shall be arbitrated, that nothing shall be decided by any other means. I trust that the day is not far distant when it will be impossible to conceive of such a thing as England and America going to war under any circumstances whatsoever. [Applause.]

I feel that we have been going upon very mistaken ideas for a long time, and among these mistaken ideas some have very deep roots and very bad fruit. One of these, for instance, is the idea that we are two nations instead of being only one nation under two political systems, one race, one blood and one family, as we really are. What was it that took place and separated one polity from the other? It was only the action of true Englishmen who refused to be sat upon. I think we Englishmen have no one to whom greater honor is due than the men who founded the American Republic. They were Englishmen, and I think there was never a greater Englishman than George Washington himself. Why did not the Spaniards or the French or the Dutch set up a new republic in the New World? They had not the backbone and the principles that the English had. The sooner we realize that what the founders of this republic did is just what every Englishman would do if he found himself in the same condition, the sooner we shall come to look upon it from the right point of view. You have taught us a lesson, and we have profited by it. To-day the result is that our colonies remain knitted to us in bonds of union, and we look for the day when on both sides of the water it shall be recognized that you and we are still knit by these bonds, whatever mistakes we may have made on either side in the past. You cannot get rid of parentage

and sonship, and I trust we may set an example to the whole world by so actively exercising public opinion on both sides of the water that the governments shall decide once and for all that war shall never take place between these two countries.

I am glad to say that on the other side there is no anti-American feeling. I do not come across, in reputable papers, hostile references to the United States, and I wish that such statements as regards England could be always eliminated from the press on this side. The same is true of the school books. Someone has said here that a revision of some of the histories is required. I suppose in individual life as well as in national life there are none of us who would not quarrel if we had opposing sides presented to one another instead of the sympathetic sides. We want to turn the bright side, the attractive side to one another. While I heartily endorse what was said with all authority by a newspaper man last night, that it is impossible to be always urging arbitration day in and day out for fear of nauseating the people, yet it is always possible to present the bright side to our neighbor. I think in that lies the great power of the newspaper to-day.

The day has gone by when sovereigns could wage war. We have seen from the prelude to that remarkable Treaty of The Hague that it was the sovereigns that met together and decided for peace; to-day the sovereigns are for peace. It is unfortunately sometimes the people, misinformed, misguided and with prejudice fanned and pandered to by a popular press, who rouse themselves and lash themselves into a fury and demand war; it is not the sovereigns. The fault lies with the people if there is war to-day. It behooves us all to do our best to bring about a change in public opinion which shall make war impossible; because it is the public that rules in that question, not the man at the head only.

A lady this evening spoke on the important question of patriotism. There is another thing in which we are mistaken on both sides of the water; people speak of patriotism as if it meant "grab who can." Without attempting to quote Emerson I would suggest that we should establish as our idea of patriotism, not the acquisition of fresh territory for our country, not the proving that we are always in the right, but that we should teach the children that the patriot is the man who tries to make his fellow-creatures better, first in his own country, and then throughout all the world. That is why I look upon the missionary as one of the greatest patriots that we can find anywhere. I am glad that reference has been made to the missionaries to-day, because I have seen a great deal of what they are doing all the world over, and there is no power which is making more for peace than they are. [Applause.] Whatever may be the faults or the failings of the ministers at home it certainly cannot be charged to the men who are living among the people in those countries to which they have gone that their grand object is the advantage of their own native land. I have traveled among sixty nations and I have always been received as a man and a brother; and the more

we go in the spirit of brotherhood the more impossible it will be for international hatred to exist.

I hope that what has been stated in regard to the attitude of the churches in this country toward this question of international arbitration has been exaggerated. It does not exist among the churches in England. I remember that when that famous Rescript of the Czar was issued, we formed an organization to support the proposal, and the clergy supported us heartily. The feeling of the churches in England is so strong in favor of peace that when on the occasion of the recent war in South Africa a small number of our preachers tried to uphold war as reasonable under those circumstances they became immediately the butt of a very strong criticism, which I think will prevent the recurrence of such support for war on future occasions. The people realized that to excuse war is not the business of the ministers of Christ.

It has been suggested this morning that the commercial spirit makes for peace. Unfortunately, speaking from my own experience, in England, while the Christian spirit is in favor of peace, the feeling of the commercial world was one of the factors that made for war on this last occasion. The business world looked forward to the opportunity of supplying the forces, and the workingmen looked forward with keen expectation to the effect upon commerce, quite regardless of the inevitable slump that must follow. That was one of the things that helped to goad our country on to that war. It is very difficult indeed to see properly through a gold eyeglass.

I wish we could say of our army what you say of yours, that its influence is not in favor of war. Unfortunately, we have not removed the inducement of booty in the navy, but I do not think that is the chief inducement. The main thing that influences the army in favor of war, not only in England but on the Continent, is the chance of promotion. The professional soldier wants the turn of the wheel that will give him advancement, and so we find in England that military circles are strongly in favor of war.

Let me repeat the earnest desire that we may all so work day in and day out that the time may soon come when England and America may realize their common interest, their unity of race and duty as nominally Christian nations; that we put out of the question altogether any settlement of any difficulty by war, and determine that every dispute of whatever nature shall be settled by some form of arbitration.

The Conference then adjourned.

Fifth Session.

Friday Morning, May 29, 1903.

The Fifth Session of the Conference was given to addresses by Hon. Wm. J. Coombs, President of the Manufacturers' Trust Co. of New York; Mr. Edwin Ginn, of Boston; Mr. A. Foster Higgins, of New York, Chairman of the Committee on Harbors and Shipping of the Chamber of Commerce; Hon. John Field, ex-Postmaster of Philadelphia; Mr. Virginius Newton, President of the First National Bank of Richmond, Virginia; Mr. Mahlon N. Kline, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, of Boston. Several other gentlemen also spoke to resolutions, etc.

THE CHAIRMAN called the Conference to order at the usual hour and announced that the session was to be given over to addresses by business men.

He first called upon Hon. Wm. J. Coombs, of Brooklyn, saying that Mr. Coombs had served his country in Congress, and for over forty years in connection with international trade.

THE INFLUENCE OF COMMERCE UPON THE PEACE OF THE WORLD.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM J. COOMBS.

Your Committee has invited me to again address you upon the theme upon which I have frequently spoken, namely, the influence of commerce upon the peace of the world.

There are new developments in the field of commerce every year and changes in the attitude of governments caused thereby. It will be my duty, as it is my pleasure, to call your attention to them. Doubtless they will be interesting to some of you, and on account of their homely character uninteresting to others, but there is no doubt that, for the reasons mentioned, they deserve a place in the deliberations of this Convention.

At the Conference held five years ago I spoke of the beneficent influence of bringing the various commercial nations of the world into a better understanding of one another, and how the course of trade created mutual interests that made for peace. At that time trade conditions were normal and comparatively evenly balanced between manufacturing countries.

Two years ago I was obliged to modify my views, on account of

changed conditions, and warn you that the competition that up to that time had been merely a friendly trade rivalry would be intensified into an acrimonious war of retaliation.

The reason of that change, as I stated, was the appearance of this country as a strong and successful competitor for the trade of consuming nations.

European manufacturers have finally awakened to the fact that the balance of power in industrial pursuits has been disturbed, and their supremacy and very existence is threatened. They have for a long time known us as a manufacturing nation, but regarded our efforts in that direction as a mere incident instead of being an important factor in our nation's growth.

They now notice that our enormous supplies of raw material, combined with the superior skill of our artisans, backed up by a home market of eighty millions of consumers, have stimulated the growth of our factories and correspondingly decreased the cost of production.

For at least a generation we have been making inroads upon their shipments to Central and South America, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and the East; but these have been so gradual that until recently they did not realize the full significance of the change.

They have been able to hold their customers through old "trade habits," which are difficult to change, as well as by their superior banking facilities in the way of collections and credits.

They are surprised to find that these "habits" have given way and that their clients have to a greater extent than heretofore used European credits and capital in their purchases from us.

Their exports have decreased while ours have correspondingly increased to such an extent as to attract the serious attention of their governments.

Heretofore it has been a contest between individuals; now it is a contest between nations, and this is the main consideration in framing their foreign policies.

For a long time their agricultural interests have been crippled and destroyed by our competition, and they have turned their attention to manufacturing, many of their laborers becoming mechanics. They may well ask themselves the question, If our factories become unprofitable through the curtailment of their foreign output, — and they cannot exist without it, — what is left for us to do? If both agriculture and manufacturing are destroyed, how can our workmen be fed and clothed?

There is no Emperor or Cabinet strong enough to ignore these questions or to belittle their importance. Self-preservation as well as their duty require that active measures be taken to remedy the situation. To this end they can enact, and in some cases have enacted, tariff laws protecting themselves in their home markets and colonies; even England is considering the abandonment of her old liberal trade policy; but that is not enough. New colonies whose trade can be controlled must be secured. This effort to secure new

colonies and new trade advantages is the great peril that to-day confronts us.

As an illustration of this, let me refer to the situation in Germany, which is probably more serious than that of any other country. Her efforts to build up her agricultural interests by the establishment of the beet sugar industry with government bounties has been an expensive failure. Her agrarian party has sought new advantages and has succeeded, notwithstanding the disfavor with which her rulers looked upon the measure, in imposing prohibitive duties upon breadstuffs, raising the cost of living in times of decreased earning capacity.

Those who have given thought to the matter are convinced that the serious dilemma in which her government found itself, threatened by a class war within her borders, prompted the recent extreme demands and the threatening demonstration against Venezuela. She knew well the enormous value of the valley of the Orinoco and how great an effect it would have in influence upon the neighboring states of Columbia if she could plant her colonies there. Her merchants are more numerous in that region than those of any other nation. Happily she did not find support or weakness where it was expected, and the incident which threatened our peace is closed.

Another peril brought about by the industrial warfare is found in the present situation of China. She has been a very important market for all manufacturing nations. It is becoming apparent that her old form of government cannot be maintained or reformed to meet the exigencies of modern conditions, that disintegration is imminent.

The nations of Europe are watching each other in order to protect their trade interests or to secure a portion of her territory for colonization. We are only asking for an open door for our commerce.

All are watching Russia as she pushes forward to completion her Trans-Siberian Railroad, beginning at Moscow, crossing European Russia through Asia, with its eastern terminus in Chinese territory upon the Pacific Ocean.

During its course of six thousand five hundred miles it consolidates into one government all of the nations and tribes in those mysterious and little known regions. She seeks to control China from the rear as well as upon the coast. Her policy at times is exposed to the world. She apparently retires, but no one believes that her real policy has changed, but that the enlargement of her borders will move forward with all the deliberateness and force of a glacier. She could not reach the Mediterranean, but she will reach the Pacific and control all the nations upon the route. That she proposes to control the trade and destinies of China is not doubted by the other nations, and they will doubtless oppose her in force, aided by the warrior nation of the Pacific, the oriental Yankee, the Japanese, a representative of which nation we have with us to-day.

It is not pleasant for us who sincerely desire that all nations shall

be at peace with one another, and that all differences that may arise between them shall be settled by arbitration, to contemplate the possibilities of war, but it is not wise for us to ignore them.

Wars are not waged in these days for the perpetuation of dynasties ; the world has outgrown that, and sovereigns are only pieces upon the chess board. Nations may vindicate their honor and resent insults by resort to arms, but in these days it seldom happens, and will be less frequent when our Court of Arbitration is better established.

In this age of commercialism the great danger lies in the desire and necessity of increasing the area of a nation's trade for its increasing productions. It is not a pleasant statement, but is it not true ? Are the centuries of the wars of chivalry, wars for freedom of conscience, wars for personal freedom, only to give place to wars for the almighty dollar ? Has the spirit of the teachings of Christ, which, working through eighteen centuries, has dissipated superstition, ameliorated cruelties, enfranchised the individual by breaking the chains of tyrants, and raised the ideals of humanity, come to so miserable an ending ?

I do not for a moment believe it, but regard what I have pointed out as the outbreak of a disease that will run its course, shorter on account of its intensity, and be cured by the benevolent spirit of Christianity, which regards the welfare of all of God's creatures without respect to nationality. His spirit will sooner or later prevail, and when that time comes each nation will regard the extraordinary resources placed by the Creator within its borders as trusts to be used for the benefit of humanity at large.

As the foremost nation in industrial developments, whose rapid and extraordinary success has precipitated the conflict, we are placed in a position of immense responsibility. Our great natural resources, as yet but partially developed, are a guarantee that we shall continue to lead in the race, and our attitude will determine that of other nations. If our success makes us grasping and selfish, determined to push our advantages to the utmost, regardless of the welfare of others, we shall be instigators of increasing discord. If, on the other hand, our successes make us magnanimous and generous, we shall shape our national policies in such a way as to quiet the storm.

I cannot divest myself of the belief that America, which remained undiscovered until the condition of the Old World required that there should be a refuge provided for the oppressed and downtrodden, belongs in a large sense to humanity as a whole. Its mountains, rich in metals, useful and precious, its grand forests and prairies of virgin soil, its enormous rivers, rich in food and penetrating the interior of a continent washed on either shore by a great ocean, were hidden from the sight of men until God's time came for revealing them. Instead of impoverishing, it should enrich the world at large ; instead of keeping all that it has and getting all that it can, it should "consider the things of others."

The influence of a convention composed of earnest men and women, such as I see before me, can and should be felt throughout the land.

If its attitude is a protest against greed, if the eminent men and women who assemble here, in their writings and teachings speak for a broader benevolence and discourage the growth of selfishness, it will not be long before the aggressions of commercialism will feel the rebuke.

Some things that I have said may seem to you theoretical and unpractical, but I am sure that they are in the line of God's purposes as exhibited in His works, and His plans are not theories, they are the underlying principles of the universe, and will prevail.

The Chairman next introduced Mr. Edwin Ginn, of Boston, head of the publishing house of Ginn & Company.

A MORE EFFICIENT ORGANIZATION OF THE PEACE FORCES OF THE WORLD.

ADDRESS OF MR. EDWIN GINN.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Since meeting with you two years ago I have done considerable work along the lines then laid down, of furnishing the best peace literature to the people at trifling cost. I must frankly say that I have been disappointed in my efforts to raise adequate funds to carry on as vigorously as I had hoped this great peace work. There is too much apathy. People as a rule are too busy with their own concerns to give much time and thought to public affairs which are not in some way connected with their personal interests. This in general is, perhaps, as it should be, for no enterprise will succeed without the undivided attention of those who have it in hand. If this is true as regards our personal affairs, why should it not be true as regards great public interests? How can we expect to see them advanced as they should be unless taken in hand by those who will devote themselves entirely to the work, giving their whole time and thought to it? We want to make it possible for the best men to give their whole time to it. For such coöperation as I have received I am most grateful; and I wish particularly to say that one member of this Conference last year pledged \$1,000 a year to help the work.

I think we are making a mistake in the manner of conducting this campaign. I mean we are not consecutive and persistent enough. We come here year after year and discuss the subject for two or three days and send out pretty widely a report of what is said and done. This is good as far as it goes. It is well for us to meet together, compare notes and inspire each other with fresh courage. But it is not enough. We ourselves have a keen sense of the horrors of war and the blessings of peace. We need to bring this subject to the attention of others who are not yet alive to the situation, in such a way that they cannot resist our appeal. To men of

wealth and influence this question is not yet a burning and vital issue. The large sums of money required for the maintenance of our vast armies and navies are paid indirectly, and the individual does not feel the burden of the tax assessed upon him. This is true not only of the rich, but of all classes. It is so far in the background that we do not personally feel the effects of war. Although ten thousand homes are made desolate yearly by its ravages, and all of us have suffered to a greater or less extent, yet we must admit that, while to some of us it is the most important subject in the whole world, the great mass of the people give it but a passing thought.

In reality, war affects every human being financially, educationally and morally. And yet even those of us who come here year after year do not half realize the menace it is to us, individually and as a nation. If we did, should we be content to give but three days in the year to the consideration of such an important matter, and less than one per cent. of our income to carrying on a campaign against such an evil? We do not fully realize that we are daily contributing more towards the destruction of our fellowmen than for their education and elevation; that even in times of peace we are taking from happy homes the world over, a portion or all of the time, something like five millions of men—the young, the able-bodied, the flower of the land,—and crowding them into unhealthy camps, where they sicken and die as fast as in actual battle, and leaving the burdens they should bear to fall upon old men, delicate women and children.

The individuals composing the nations are becoming civilized and law-abiding, having their differences settled in the courts. Various societies the world over, having in view the public good, hold conventions and decide matters pertaining to their best interests, not as Germans, Britons, Americans or Frenchmen, but as citizens of the world, having at heart the welfare of their fellows everywhere. We, too, should have our parliament of nations, represented by our best men, who should meet together and discuss all international problems in a broad-minded spirit. With such a congress the armaments of the nations might be reduced to a small police force and the strained relations which now exist would be removed. There should be a special commission for the regulation of boundary lines, one of the greatest sources of trouble between nations.

We should have representatives whose business it would be to travel over the country, speaking in important centres, and meeting men in every department of life,—educators, the clergy, merchants, bankers, farmers, those engaged in transportation; all classes should be reached. Good literature should be introduced into every school in the land, that the children may be taught that true patriotism does not mean helping to support vast armies, but earnest work for the uplifting of mankind.

We need, as one important instrument, a weekly journal, ably edited, which should be sent broadcast over the land. This, I

believe, would accomplish wonders in the education of the masses. We also need to publish and scatter the best literature of all ages on this great subject of peace versus war. This we have begun to do, as perhaps most of you know. During the past year we have brought out "The Future of War" by Jean de Bloch, Sumner's "Addresses on War," and William Ellery Channing's "Discourses on War." Many copies have been sold, and several hundred sent to the press and given away where they would do the most good. These books have attracted much attention, and the reviews which have come to us show a deep-seated peace sentiment in the press the world over. In many of the best journals of the land, not simply a column, but in some cases a whole page, has been given to this subject.

Now all this cannot be done for nothing. One or two men cannot carry it along alone. It is a work that calls for a large endowment. We must have an organization on a permanent basis if we would accomplish anything worth the doing. And I want to say here, lest I may be misunderstood, that I am conscious of the great work Mr. Smiley is doing here. It is unique and unequalled in this world, so far as I know — the bringing together of such a vast number of influential people.

In the most necessary and fundamental work of perfecting a more efficient organization of the peace forces, I think we may look more confidently than heretofore to public-spirited men of large wealth for the endowment we so much need. The speech of Andrew Carnegie at the annual meeting of the Iron and Steel Institute, held in London the 7th of this month, shows that he is with us. The splendid gift from him, just announced, for the permanent housing of the Hague Tribunal, warrants the hope that he may aid us materially in this fundamental work of establishing a permanent educational organization. Such an organization, under some such title as "The International Union," with a strong support of leading and influential men, and with our revered Dr. Hale as its president, would surely appeal to him. He is always ready and willing to aid in carrying on any well-founded undertaking; but he is essentially a business man, and we must show him and others that we mean business.

I have talked with another generous man of great wealth, who has given distinct encouragement. Many of us must lend a strong hand. While we have great reason to hope for something definite from a few rich men, I think we must finally rely upon the masses of the people for carrying on this work. The success of this great cause should not depend upon one or two men; if it did, its permanency would be doubtful. The people are vitally interested, and to them we should look for permanent support. Everyone who has property beyond the actual needs of daily life should feel that it is not only his pleasure, but his duty, to contribute to this great cause, and those who have not money should give a portion of their time. Our hope lies, not with the few, but with the many, and in the active coöperation of all.

And let us organize ourselves. Mr. Mead emphasized the importance of getting the International Peace Congress to America next year, as a conspicuous means of influencing public opinion. Let us all work for that. If we do get it, we must have not only sessions in one city, say New York, but conventions in Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, and St. Louis. In every one of these cities strong committees must be organized a year in advance to make these great Peace meetings emphatic successes. These strong committees, once organized, must never go out of business; they must continue permanently to push the Peace cause in our cities, with new cities constantly coming in. These many societies uniting will perhaps best constitute our International Union. But let none of us waste time.

The next speaker introduced was A. Foster Higgins, Chairman of the Committee on Harbors and Shipping of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

ADDRESS OF MR. A. FOSTER HIGGINS.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Convention: I have been asked as a business man to speak upon the subject which interests all of us who are here present.

I think possibly the minds of the laymen and of the ladies hardly appreciate what arbitration means, what sense the word conveys to the mind of the business man. There is a very grave distinction between courts of arbitration and courts of justice. We go to a court of justice to get what we feel is our right, and we expect to attain that which we claim. Courts of justice very rarely compromise matters; they decide which one of the claimants is entitled to a judgment, and they give it to him. But with arbitrations it is the experience of most business people that one side chooses an arbitrator, and the other side chooses another (each one is the warm friend or confidant of his selected principal), and those two select a third. They present their sides, and the third arbitrator simply divides the difference between the two. The man who goes in for an arbitration is almost always someone who is afraid that he is not entitled to what he claims, and thinks that by an arbitration he can get a portion of it at least. We established a court in connection with the Chamber of Commerce of New York, which we called the Court of Arbitration. I think I may venture to say that there have not been twenty-five cases presented to that court, and it is now thirty-five years since we established it. That is a proof of my assertion above.

The very eminent Japanese Consul here present stated that there are three ways of settling disputes — by diplomacy, by arbitration and by war. When you go to court to get your rights, that is war;

when you try to exercise arbitration, I have explained the difficulties that confront you; and as to diplomacy, that depends simply upon the individual talent of the man who is occupying the position of the diplomat.

Perhaps I can give you two or three instances which illustrate what diplomacy means in business. One of the great railroad presidents called upon Samuel Barlow, a man well known in New York, a very distinguished lawyer, and told him that he had a very important case against another railroad, mentioning the case. Mr. Barlow said: "I am on the other side, but I can sit here and listen to your story, and perhaps I can bring you to an agreement." Mr. Huntington accepted the proposal, and Mr. Barlow heard both sides of the case, and in two hours he had settled the difficulty which had lasted for two years. They asked him for his bill, and he rendered a bill for \$50,000, and they paid it with great alacrity and great pleasure.

I had a case myself which was of a very complicated character, involving questions arising out of the Civil War. I was opposed by Judge Campbell, who was on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States before the war. I asked for an interview and called upon him, and he commenced to tell me the outrage which had been perpetrated upon his people. I let him talk for perhaps half an hour, and then I said to him: "Now, Judge Campbell, we are gentlemen, and we are trying to settle this difficulty. If two honest people disagree, and one puts himself in this position, — and it must be a tenable position, one that can be maintained, — and the other occupies this position, — and it is also tenable and reasonable, — there should be a point midway on which they can meet." He said: "That is perfectly true and good sense." I said: "I will meet you half way." "Agreed," he said. I shook hands with him, and it resulted in settling a case involving over \$600,000. That I call diplomacy.

In the Chamber of Commerce we represent vast interests, hundreds of millions of dollars, and the interests are very timid. You can rely absolutely on the fact that so far as any disturbance — to say nothing of war — is concerned, the members of the Chamber of Commerce of New York are always in favor of peace. But we have to make certain reservations. There have been times when I have been a witness of a spirit in the Chamber of Commerce of the most animated character declaring itself for war, and that was when we felt that the unity of the nation was imperilled, and that its preservation was of importance not only to present but to future generations.

In considering the exercise of diplomacy and the modes of settling difficulties peaceably, we must remember that there are certain things which cannot be settled in that way. If a man comes and claims that your house is his, and he gives you no proof of it at all, you cannot arbitrate upon a subject like that. Nor can you arbitrate

upon subjects where nations are claiming rights which they are meaning to take in spite of all law and justice. That is, I believe, the difficulty that we shall meet in the future in making the court at The Hague able to settle all difficulties; it is almost impossible to do it.

The commerce of the world is changing everything. I know of no point in which my own mind has been more seriously impressed than it has been in the study of political economy. As I commenced to read the writers from Adam Smith down, I found that early writers gave certain definitions to certain terms, as to what constituted "labor," "capital," "power," etc.; and each writer in turn began by annihilating everything that other writers had said. But all agreed upon the selfishness of mankind; that every man was bound to gratify his wishes in the cheapest, most expeditious and most direct manner possible; that the selfishness of mankind was the principle which governed the world. All laws of political economy were deduced from this principle. No writer on political economy to-day can write in that way. If he does he will make a most frightful error. Suppose that seventy-five years ago we had had a committee of the writers on political economy, and the proposition had been put to them: We have in our midst a system, a condition, which is increasing, and we are afraid of its future status. I am referring now to the condition of slavery. We will say that fifty years from to-day slavery will represent not only one or two millions, but from five to seven millions of souls, and its interests will become so diversified, so expanded and so great that one-half of the whole nation will live upon it, and to extirpate it will cost three thousand millions of dollars and at least three hundred thousand lives. What is going to be the outcome? Will the institution of slavery be perpetual, or shall we ever be able to exterminate it? The answer would be: No; selfish mankind cannot imagine making such a sacrifice to attain that end! We have seen that identical thing accomplished, at that very identical cost.

Now, here we have introduced into the world a new principle, the principle of altruism, which is growing with every generation, which influences every condition of opinion and society. No man can write upon any subject, and make any prophecy as to the future, without taking into account this great principle of altruism. We are changing, being changed, and shall be changed, from a money-worshipping nation to a nation of higher aspirations and higher attainments.

For myself, I stand in a dreadful apprehension of the conflict which threatens on all sides between labor and capital. We have to stop and think that ignorance only knows one mode of accomplishing its end, and that is by violence. You have got to educate and teach the laboring man that violence will not attain his end, or these conflicts will go on in the most bloody manner.

We have hopes arising out of the great progress that the world is making in education and in various other ways. I came here very unexpectedly, at the invitation of Mr. Smiley, suggested, I think, by

my friend Mr. Brown, and I hope that every man and every woman here has had the same experience as I have. It has been to me a breath of heaven. I cannot imagine a nearer access to heaven than to see the spirit which I have seen evidenced here in this convocation. The unity, the charity, the loving spirit, the aspirations and the objects are worthy of heaven. I believe that when we die we shall be classified, and we shall go into that next life in the company of those who have similar feelings to ourselves. I trust that in the great convocation above I may be able to put myself under the guidance of our worthy friend, and be marshalled by him into the presence of our Divine Master, to carry on the work there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of presenting to you the Hon. John Field, ex-postmaster of Philadelphia.

THE BUSINESS MAN AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN FIELD.

When I was here a year ago and heard that sweet speech from Miss Smiley, I promised myself that I would leave this place and plant, hill by hill, the seed which I had received, and I have tried faithfully to keep that promise.

I suppose that about the first biography we have of a business man is the story of Whittington and his cat, and I don't believe that even J. P. Morgan ever brought such wonderful results out of a cat or any other deal as Dick Whittington did.

I know very well that the idea is that a merchant, a business man, is one who has a piece of money, a dollar, for instance, and he is trying to get a dollar which belongs to another man, and put them both in his pocket. [Laughter.] But that is not a true idea of the merchant. You remember that the merchants are about the only class of men commended in the Scripture. Isaiah says: "Who hath taken this counsel against Tyre, the crowning city, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honorable of the earth?" I believe that stands true to-day; no doubt there are some exceptions, but my experience is that the business men of the country are honorable and true men in their dealings with their fellows. It is well that you call the business men into this great council; business is the most important thing there is in the world to-day. There is more brain power, more thought, more muscle put into the great business interests of the country than is put into any other profession or calling.

Business is not one of the Muses; it is not as pretty as a picture or a poem — of course, I don't refer to the "bargain counter," because with many ladies that is a "thing of beauty" and a "joy forever." [Laughter.] I have said what I have to bring before you what an important element after all we business people constitute in this world of ours.

It was my great pleasure to have been sent by the government to the International Congress of Commerce and Industry at Ostend under the auspices of Belgium last August. We had delegates there from various countries, and while we discussed capital and labor, free trade and tariff, yet the undercurrent, the underlying thought of that convention, was "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men." [Applause.] I also had the honor for two years of being president of one of the greatest commercial organizations of our country, the National Credit Men's Association, consisting of four thousand five hundred active credit men in all classes of business, scattered throughout the country. I think you might sum up their platform in the exhortation of St. Paul: "As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."

A word on another point. Arbitration in the business world has been referred to here: let me give you a bit of my experience. I was called upon sometime ago by the stonecutters to act as arbitrator in their dispute with the employers. After an afternoon's conference in my office the difficulty was settled, and it has remained settled since. Just before I came away the elevator builders in our city had a great strike, and I was again selected as the arbitrator. I spent two days going over the matter, and finally rendered a decision against the workmen, because I believed they were in the wrong. After I had rendered my decision one of the workmen said, "You will hear from us again," and to my surprise, and to their honor and credit be it said, a committee of the workmen visited my office and presented me with an engraved, framed set of resolutions, thanking me for my time, my patience and my impartiality in deciding the case. [Applause.]

Arbitration is in the air, it is controlling men, and bringing us to a higher sense of our obligations to each other.

The Chairman next introduced Mr. Virginius Newton, president of the First National Bank of Richmond, Va.

THE DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF THE CIVIL WAR ON THE SOUTH.

ADDRESS OF VIRGINIUS NEWTON.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference: I rise merely to acknowledge the compliment given to me by the Business Committee in asking me to consume five minutes of your time. Yet I feel that I owe this call to peculiar circumstances; I owe this introduction to the culture, refinement and intellect of your section to the fact that I come from a part of our common country which is conspicuous by its absence from your meeting. My portion of country is that south of the Potomac, east of the Mississippi. It is localized sometimes by the name of "The Old Dominion," once the mother of States and statesmen. It is by virtue of that habitat that I stand before you to-day. I feel that I have in my heart a message to deliver,

and yet physical disability has prevented me from making any preparation.

Time was when we were not absent from your councils and your deliberations upon matters affecting the general interests of the nation. The present President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, in his very readable contribution to the series of American Statesmen, "Gouverneur Morris," states that the Old Dominion is easily first in the great men that she has given to the nation. She gave you a Washington, made in so large a mould, as Lowell says, that a nation claimed him; a Lee who moved in the Congress of the Confederation for the committee, of which Jefferson was chairman, who drew up your Declaration of Independence; and when peace came to our troubled land, a Madison whose wise and pacific statesmanship, in the Convention of 1787, has justly entitled him to the title of the "Father of the Constitution of the United States." She gave you also a Marshall who drew in the decisions of the Supreme Court the lines within which the national and State governments have ever since moved, and gave so high a service that he is now yearly commemorated by our jurists and lawyers on John Marshall's Day. It is a significant fact that in the beginnings of our country, of the first five Chief Magistrates who presided over our destinies, four came from Virginia. It was not mere accident; it indicates that there was the presence of both brawn and brain in that section of country. I trust that you will pardon these references to my locality, for I dislike the appearance of provincialism; I mention these historical facts as a prelude to that which I wish to say.

The question has been asked me from time to time since I participated in this gathering—it is illuminating, it is uplifting to enjoy the hospitality of our kind host, whose heart is so large that I am sure it would embrace the whole South [Mr. Smiley: Yes, yes.]—I have been asked why it is that my people are absent from these councils. I desire to say, with all the truth and soberness with which it is given to me to speak, that it is because of war—the miseries, the destruction of war! You have in your presence at this moment gentlemen who recently attended the educational conference in the capital city of my State,—Mr. St. Clair McKelway, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Mr. John Crosby Brown,—who doubtless came back from that conference with an illumination and information by contact with those people which they had not before. I think that in the future their labors will testify to something of a change of sentiment in regard to the conditions that lie before my people. They have one of the hardest problems ever committed to a people to solve, and they require, and they demand, your kindly sympathy and assistance in that duty.

It was one of your own men, Sherman, whose bitter experiences led him to the utterance, "War is hell." I stand before you to testify that in my own person from the beginning to the end of that fateful struggle, of that fateful war, I drank deep of its disasters. Old enough to have known something of the conditions of the South before the war, a participant in its trials and miseries, and the degrading and

baneful effects of reconstruction, I stand before you and say that my people, of all people in this country, are advocates of arbitration to-day. [Applause.]

There are those of you present old enough to look back and recall the conditions which presented themselves to the two sections of the country at the close of '65, when over one million men laid down their arms and sought again the paths of peace. Think of the contrast! You returned to a civilization little changed, a society not demoralized, industries, educational influences, perhaps stimulated beyond your expectation. You felt little change in the return from army life to civil life; you easily adjusted yourself to those conditions. We south of the Potomac, after four years of weary war, in which everything was consumed that was within our limits, faced the bare problem of bread and meat, — everything wrecked before us. We had not been a manufacturing people; few or none of the industries were with us; we were purely agricultural; the few advances that we had made in manufacturing had been swept away; our whole system of labor and society was demoralized; the leaders of our thought, such as they were, whether for good or evil, were brushed aside, disfranchised, made incapable of holding office, incapable of showing the lead. I thoroughly believe that to no people that I can recall within the bounds of history has been submitted a problem so severe, an ordeal so difficult, as that which was submitted to the people of the South at the close of the war. We have simply had to face to the front and address ourselves to conditions novel and crucial; and now, after forty years, I stand before this audience and say truthfully that the destructive influence of four years of war may not be repaired in forty years of peace, that we of the South to-day feel the miseries of that time, and are only slowly and painfully emerging from them. I ask you to be patient with the people of my section; they have a hard problem before them, one which you must unite with us in solving, for we belong to a common country, and have a common destiny. The three-fifths clause of the Constitution which gave representation to the South in Congress for its slave population was bought of you for a price. You received commercial and navigation privileges which you sought. Our fathers made a compromise, and, in doing so, ate the sour grapes that set their children's teeth on edge. If their compromise was evil, we cannot escape the fruitage of it, — we cannot lift the burden alone; we ask for your assistance, with the assurance that the people of the South are in the fullest accord with you on the subject of international arbitration. We ask of you that patience of consideration so sublimely penned by Kepler, when he gave to the world his discovery of the laws of the planetary movements: "I may well wait a century for a reader, as God has waited a thousand years for an observer."

MR. SMILEY: Mr. Newton spoke of there being no people from the South in this Conference. That is not in consequence of any want of effort to get them here. We have the warmest sympathy for

the South, and nothing would delight us more than to see many just such people as Mr. Newton here.

MR. NEWTON: I would like to make reply to what Mr. Smiley has just said. Your material resources are so vast that you can do almost anything you wish to do, build up, add to, magnify. To us who live in parts where because of the war poverty reigns, what you accomplish is almost like the transformations wrought by Aladdin's lamp. We have not the time or the means to attend these Conferences in which we are so much interested.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was one of those who spent nearly four years in that contest; I know something about it, and I am responsible for some of the condition of things. But I say to-day that I would to God that the whole record might be blotted out of our history. [Applause.] It was probably inevitable, but I would be glad if we had no such record in the history of the nation. The great, glorious work of this country is not in war, but in the achievements of peace. And I am glad that we are here to consult about methods which will avoid for our country in the future all such terrible experiences as we have gone through in the past. [Applause].

Mr. Mahlon N. Kline of Philadelphia has a resolution which he wishes to offer.

REMARKS OF MAHLON N. KLINE.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Convention: I have been delegated by the Business Committee to present this resolution, but I want to introduce it with a two-minute speech.

I want to say on behalf of the business interests what my associates have not referred to. It has been urged here by the clergymen, the educators and the lawyers, that they have done much to make sentiment in regard to arbitration, and I admit all they say; but we business men also are entitled to receive a little consideration as contributing to that end. We meet frequently in those organizations which Mr. Higgins, Mr. Field and myself represent. What for? Not for our own selfish interests, but for the purpose of promoting the general good of the membership; and thus we are educated through our business organizations to recognize the importance of the subject which we are here considering.

The resolution which I am about to offer refers to a business man who has recognized this, and in whose honor it must be said that while he has accumulated an immense fortune he has never forgotten that he is one of a large community, and therefore he has contributed that which will make possible a worthy abode for the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration have heard of the offer by Andrew Carnegie of fifteen hundred thousand dollars to provide a Temple of Peace as a home for the International Court of Arbitration at The

Hague; and they wish to express their appreciation of this noble gift by this leader in the world of commerce, and they rejoice at this recognition by him of the importance of the principle of arbitration.

The cordial thanks of this Conference are hereby extended to Andrew Carnegie for this generous contribution to the great cause of arbitration among nations and of peace throughout the world.

The Chairman and Secretary are instructed to send a copy of these heartfelt words to Andrew Carnegie.

The resolution was put to the Conference and carried unanimously by a rising vote.

MR. JOHN CROSBY BROWN: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference:* If you want anything done in this world you must go to the busiest man you can find, and then you will have it promptly attended to. It is in this spirit that I have been requested by the Business Committee to offer for adoption the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of this Conference, Hon. John W. Foster, be requested to prepare and publish, at his convenience and in his own way, a monograph on international arbitration, which shall present the cream of what has been said in the successive conferences held at Mohonk Lake as to the history, progress and prospects of international arbitration.

We all know that whatever Mr. Foster writes is sure of a very wide reading. His two books, with which we are familiar, have been spread broadcast over this country, and have been read by a larger number of people than perhaps any books of their kind recently. We want to influence public opinion in favor of arbitration, and if we can induce Mr. Foster in his own time and in his own way to issue over his own signature a monograph embodying the substance of what we are working for here, I am sure that it will have a larger influence than anything else that can be done by this Conference.

The Secretary, Mr. C. R. Woodruff, put the resolution to the Conference, and it was adopted by a rising vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown has already made my apology. I have a great many things to do, and I ought not really, considering this, to be here to-day; but as it is left to my own time, I suppose I may accept the duty and hope to accomplish it before I die.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD: *Mr. Chairman:* I do not rise to make a speech, but simply to explain a document which I have here, a copy of which I shall be glad to hand to any of the members of the Conference at the close of the session.

In order to understand thoroughly the international arbitration movement, we must consider it in its connection with many other things. One of the reasons why we Mohonk people do not become more enthusiastic over the subject which calls us together is that we do not go into the relations between this movement and certain others which are allied to it.

I have been given the liberty by the Business Committee to call your attention to a movement which originated the past winter in

Massachusetts in the interest of the same great end for which we are working here, the permanent peace of the world.

Parallel with the arbitration movement of the last century has gone another kindred movement of equally great significance, a movement which has expressed itself in international congresses, in which from time to time a number of nations — sometimes five, sometimes ten, sometimes twenty or more, and in the case of the Universal Postal Congress all the nations of the world — have met by their representatives to consider important questions of common interest to them. There have been more than thirty of these congresses since 1815, and they have increased in frequency during the last two decades, until at the present time there is one held on the average about every two years.

Now, it occurred to some of us that in the work of bringing the world to greater unity and concord the time had come for another important step forward. We knew that in the early days of the international peace movement, along with the idea of the permanent international court went always the idea of a stated international congress. The permanent court we saw established and already beginning its work, and were convinced that so far as arbitration was concerned the cause was already won, that henceforth from this point of view it was only a question of working out the details of the system.

It seemed to the American Peace Society, therefore, that the time had come to move for a stated congress of the nations of the world, as the counterpart and complement of the international court. A list of something like thirty of the congresses which have been held was made, and a memorial prepared in favor of turning these congresses held at irregular intervals into a permanent institution, to meet every five or seven years, to deliberate upon matters of general international interest, and to make recommendations to the governments thereon. The memorial did not suggest the creation of an international legislature, but simply to make general and permanent what had been taking place for a century in the congresses held for deliberation and advice. This memorial, with the list of congresses, was sent to the Massachusetts Legislature in January last. It was referred to the Joint Committee on Federal Relations for examination. The committee, after considering the subject and giving a hearing on it, reported to the General Court resolutions asking the Congress of the United States to authorize the President to invite the nations of the world to join in creating such an international congress, in whatever way they might think best. These resolutions were unanimously adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate.

The Governor of Massachusetts has expressed his most cordial endorsement of the action of the Legislature, in a letter which is printed in this document. The document gives the original memorial and the resolutions which were adopted by the General Court. I

shall be glad to hand any of you who may wish it a copy of the paper at the end of the session.

The proposition for a regular congress of representatives of the nations of the world, thus endorsed by the government of Massachusetts, has been almost unanimously approved wherever it has become known. The resolutions will be sent to Congress next winter by the Clerk of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and the originators of the movement will be glad to have the members of this Conference interest themselves in its success as far as they may see their way to do so. (For copies of the document here alluded to, apply to the American Peace Society, 31 Beacon St., Boston.)

MR. SMILEY: At the Exposition at St. Louis next year there are to be congresses on various subjects, and one gentleman, whose name I have now forgotten, is at the head and makes all the arrangements for those congresses. I received a letter from him asking that this Conference should have a meeting at St. Louis, and he would give us proper rooms and provide everything for us there. Now I think it very important that a congress of this character should be held there. I have not answered his letter, but I shall answer it in this way: that I do not think that it would be the best thing for the Mohonk Conference, under the name of the Mohonk Conference, to be held there. I feel very sure that I could not attend it, and those who manage this Conference could not attend it, and it could not be a Mohonk Conference. Therefore, I should object to undertaking to hold such a gathering at St. Louis under the name of the Mohonk Conference. But I do hope that something may be done. Perhaps members of the Conference here may set on foot a movement to have a similar conference of selected men and women meet at St. Louis and discuss this very important matter.

DR. MOXOM: May I offer a suggestion? Is it not entirely in the province of the American Peace Society—which is not a narrow-gauge peace society, but is a comprehensive movement for securing all those ends which make for international peace—to call together a conference on international arbitration, and be the moving force in it? It would meet the end required by this correspondent, and also meet Mr. Smiley's view.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: The matter has been under consideration by officers of the American Peace Society for many months, and steps have already been taken toward holding somewhere in the country next year a great international arbitration and peace congress. The men prominent in the work in Europe have already been consulted, but it will be some time before we can make public any of the details of the project. An influential man of means has offered to pay the expenses to and from such a congress of a number of the leading international peace workers of Europe; and it is hoped that we may get together a great congress, either in New York or Boston or St. Louis, of the leading workers throughout the world.

DR. HALE: May I make a single statement by way of explanation? The subject has been brought up last year, and again this year, of the establishment in the principal cities of what you might call branches of this Conference. I am authorized by the gentlemen most interested to say that progress is being made in this direction, and anybody can learn more about the subject by addressing either Mr. Ginn, Mr. Mead or myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: I came here with a good deal of inconvenience, and it is absolutely necessary that I should be in Washington to-morrow morning. This will explain my absence from the Chair this evening.

MR. SMILEY: We let off our honored President here with the condition attached—and his wife endorses the condition—that he come here and preside next year. [Applause.]

Dr. Hale moved that the thanks of the Conference be given to Mr. Foster for his services as presiding officer, and the motion was unanimously carried by a rising vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to express my thanks to each and all of you for the kindness with which I have been received, both when presiding and when I have been out of the Chair.

The Conference then adjourned.

Sixth Session.

Friday Evening, May 29, 1903.

The exercises of the sixth and last session of the Conference were an address by Rear Admiral Albert S. Barker; the adoption of the platform of the Conference, which was introduced by Hon. John I. Gilbert of Malone, N. Y., and seconded by Hon. Robert Treat Paine of Boston, and Hon. H. B. F. Macfarland of Washington, D. C.; a resolution introduced by Clinton Rogers Woodruff, which had been advocated by ex-Congressman Barrows; a resolution of thanks to Mr. Smiley, introduced by John B. Garrett and seconded by E. L. Holden of Cleveland, O.; and short addresses by Dr. T. L. Cuyler, Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins, and Miss Sarah F. Smiley.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr. John Crosby Brown, who had been selected to preside at the evening session in the absence of Mr. Foster, said, on calling the Conference to order: I am sure the Conference will condole with me because, by the command of the inexorable Business Committee and Mr. Smiley's still more irresistible persuasion, I am obliged this evening to discharge the duties that have been so gracefully discharged by our distinguished Chairman, Mr. Foster, who was obliged to leave us this afternoon.

We have already heard — to the surprise of some of us I have no doubt — what a wonderful peace agent the army is. We are to hear now from the sister branch of the service, from the navy, and I have the pleasure of introducing to you Rear Admiral Barker of the United States Navy.

NAVAL OFFICERS DESIRE PEACE.

ADDRESS OF REAR ADMIRAL ALBERT S. BARKER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As the senior naval officer in this Conference I have been asked to say a few words on the subject under consideration.

For my part, I am not surprised at the rapid advance which arbitration has made during the past few years. Christianity has been preached for nineteen centuries, and it would be strange indeed if such results did not follow; for to me, a layman, it seems axiomatic that just in proportion as individuals and nations are guided by the principles of the Golden Rule war will disappear.

But, sir, I would not stand here to-night if I did not know that many in this audience honestly believe that officers of the United States navy not only are opposed to arbitration, but that they desire war upon the least provocation in order that they may be promoted

thereby. Indeed, an Englishman on this very spot last night asserted it in so many words in regard to his own countrymen; and a few months ago I was told by one who ought to know that it was the prevailing opinion among the intelligent people of the United States that we, the officers of the navy, wanted the late war with Spain. Why such an opinion should prevail I cannot imagine. I believe that there are no people in the United States to-day — and I do not except the Society of Friends, or the educated clergy — who would so gladly welcome arbitration in settling disputes between nations as the officers of the United States navy.

And now, tell me, what is there in the history of the navy, from its very beginning until now, to give you such a contemptible opinion of us? [Laughter.] Was Commodore Preble governed by unworthy motives when he taught the pirates of the Mediterranean to respect our flag, and rescued Christian captives from Moorish dungeons? Did Commodore Perry want war when through courtesy and kindness and diplomacy he introduced Japan to the civilized Western world, and made Japan a friend of ours forever? [Applause.] Did Admiral Farragut *want* war, when with sad, breaking heart he left kindred and friends to fight for the preservation of the Union?

Mr. Chairman, since we have been here we have heard a great deal said, and justly said, of the honest, straightforward and brilliant diplomacy of the State Department in regard to affairs in China; but, sir, I have heard not one word said in commendation of Admiral Kempff, who commanded our ships in Chinese waters, and, without instructions from his government, but on his own responsibility, resisted the appeals of all the other admirals of the foreign services, and declared that he would not fire on the Taku forts and thus make war upon a nation with whom we were at peace.

I tell you, sir, that the naval officers do not want war, but they *do* desire peace. Yet, as honestly as they desire peace, they know — at least, they believe — that to maintain peace a strong navy is necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Conference will now listen to the platform, which has been prepared by the Business Committee, and which will be introduced by the Hon. John I. Gilbert of Malone, N. Y.

SUCCESS ACHIEVED AND SUCCESS YET TO BE ACHIEVED.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN. I. GILBERT ON THE PLATFORM.

Mr. Chairman: The Business Committee present to you the following platform:

PLATFORM OF THE NINTH LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

The principle of international arbitration has secured the approval of the civilized world. This fact is solemnly recorded by the Hague Convention.

It is gratifying to state that, largely through the influence and example of the United States, which had so much to do with the success of the Hague Conference, prestige has been given to the Hague Tribunal by the submission to it of international differences. This Conference thanks our government for what it has done in this behalf, especially in the recent Venezuelan controversy, when its efforts averted war.

This Conference believes that the next step in the steady march forward should be the conclusion of a treaty of obligatory arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, to be followed by similar agreements between the other nations signatory to the Hague Convention to refer disputes to the Hague Tribunal. Such treaties would make the present implied obligations of the nations signing them explicit, binding and permanent, instead of leaving them, as now, under the Hague Convention, voluntary, and to be determined from time to time, and largely by circumstances. This Conference believes that the best public opinion of the United States and Great Britain, neighbors and kinsfolk as they are, recognizes the wisdom and justice of such an arrangement, and that the example thus set would be followed speedily by the other powers. It would lead all the nations to the Hague Tribunal.

With a deep sense of the fatherhood of God and the consequent brotherhood of man, the Conference looks forward to new victories for its cause even more remarkable than those already won, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way of extending the application of international arbitration.

Many motives may inspire arbitration, — fear, horror of war, dread of expense, — but justice is the only safe foundation for the world's peace.

In the Alaskan boundary dispute, who would not prefer that justice should prevail even if we make no gain of hills and harbors? America should conduct its claim with such loyalty to justice as to win the honor of the nations.

This Conference summons all possible agencies to teach and preach the gospel of justice. Business men and great corporations, teachers in schools, ministers of God, the public press — let our whole country accept the great motto and seek to live up to it: "America loves Justice." It appeals to every man and woman to aid in increasing and organizing the general sentiment in favor of international arbitration so as to secure, by the invincible power of public opinion, the employment of it in the maximum number of possible cases, in the hope that wars may cease and that peace may prevail.

The Committee present this platform in the hope that it will meet your approval and give fair expression in a general way to the sentiments and aspirations and convictions that are common to us all.

It is very gratifying for us as friends of this cause that we are able to put at the head of this platform the declaration that the

principle of arbitration has already won the confidence of the world, the civilized world; it is no longer a problem. Only a year ago there were doubtless some of those who were gathered here in this room who were not without fear as to the practical operation of this Tribunal which has so happily been established, but this year I have not heard a doubt expressed as to the wisdom and efficiency of this pacific, rational way of settling differences between nations.

Now the question arises as to what is to be done next. Since our last meeting a step forward has been taken. All of us I am sure were delighted last evening to hear from the one who so ably and well represented us in that Court, the orderly, the easy, the judicial, the successful manner in which that trial was begun, continued and ended. We may not correctly forecast the next advance in this pacific process, but in our judgment the next step should be to induce this nation with others, beginning with Great Britain, to enter into agreements, by which they will oblige themselves by contract, put themselves under contractual as well as moral obligation, to submit their differences to this Tribunal which they themselves have helped to create.

We avoid the word "compulsory," but we think that an obligatory agreement ought to be entered into. The very fact that these nations have constituted this Court puts them under an implied moral obligation to resort to it. The object of the proposed treaty would be to translate this implied obligation into an express and permanent obligation which the nations would be bound to respect.

I venture to make one prediction: perhaps it is only a hope; perhaps it is better to put it in that form. I have such faith in the thing that ought to be; I have such faith in the human heart, bad as it is in many of its developments; I have such supreme faith in Him who is above all and in all, — I have such abiding faith in all this that I believe that the reign of law unqualified, the reign of reason unqualified, is destined to become the universal law among the civilized nations and in time among all the nations. [Applause.]

We say that we will not submit questions of honor to the Court at The Hague. What are questions of honor that are to be submitted? Why, as between individuals, when some one had said the offensive word, it was once considered a matter of honor that revenge should be taken. We have got beyond that; we now say that there was no honor about it. Now, what questions of honor can arise between nations? I think there will arise questions which will not be submitted and perhaps cannot be submitted until the sense of justice — international justice — shall become the prevalent sentiment, so that the nations shall be as willing to accord to others their rights as to claim their own. Until we are willing to do that, it is quite likely that this Court will have only limited application. But can any one of us believe for a moment that, with God overhead and the human heart within, the time is not coming when men are going to deal justly with their fellow-men? We have had some business men

speaking to us in this Conference. They are said to be, and doubtless are, governed by the finest, most responsive sense of honor and of justice in their dealings one with another. Is it too much to expect that nations will have just as fine a sense of what is right and just and due from one to another? I believe it is to come, and I believe that when it comes, if there is any matter of difference between nations, each one will say, "I have such faith in the justice of my cause that I am willing to submit it to an impartial tribunal."

It must be that we are coming to this, and I think we should all the while keep before our minds something that is in advance of accomplishment. This is a matter of growth. Growth involves outgrowth; we are continually growing out of this stage up into a higher, up into a more highly developed and ideal condition. Are not the nations progressing that way? And so I would never yield the hope that by and by—not to-day, not to-morrow, perhaps, but by and by—all the questions which are in controversy between nations, which they cannot settle among themselves—and these will grow fewer and fewer all the time—will be referred to the International Tribunal.

I agree with our Secretary, Mr. Woodruff, when he says that this Court will diminish instead of multiplying the causes of controversy. The nations will themselves become impartial judges, they themselves will reach satisfactory, because just, conclusions. Hence, to that extent there will be no need of resorting to the Court.

The existence of this Court will also develop a regard for law. The older I grow, the more I see of affairs, the more I am impressed with the vital importance of a regard for law—law everywhere, law between A and B, law between community and community, between state and state, between nation and nation.

Now, I want to throw out one word which gathers up in itself a good deal of what is in my own mind. We hear much about statesmanship. A truly magnificent word is statesmanship when it involves knowledge of the affairs of state, prescient wisdom in its guidance and unselfish devotion to its welfare. But there is something more magnificent still. It is international statesmanship. That is what we want and should cultivate,—a statesmanship that is large enough and true enough and just enough to take into account the interest not of a part only, but the interest of the whole. . . . all we learn, in the good old Scripture phrase, to think not altogether on the things of ourselves, but with equal regard upon the things of another.

We cannot do better than to borrow with slight variation the words which are of enduring application because forever true: Whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are and ought to be of good repute—first think on these things, and then act on them. And when that is done, done universally, if our International Court goes into disuse it will be because controversies have ceased to arise.

But, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have taken already too much of your time. It is hard to stop when one is thinking of

these great themes, but there are others who have thoughts to which you will gladly listen, and I give place to them.

THE LOVE OF JUSTICE AS THE MOTIVE FOR ARBITRATION.

REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, ON SECONDING THE
MOTION FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE PLATFORM.

Mr. Chairman and Friends of the Cause of Arbitration: It is a great privilege to second this motion that the platform be adopted.

There are three features in this platform to which I invite your attention. The first is the announcement to ourselves and to the world that this cause of international arbitration is now an approved success. Remember how at the first and second and I think the third Conference on this beautiful mountain many of us doubted — I will speak for myself when I say that I was in great doubt — as to whether a High Court of Nations, as Dr. Hale delighted to call it, would come while I lived. It is a great delight to recognize the fact of its success.

I wish also especially to call attention to the delightful feature in this platform that the United States has had its full share in accomplishing this result and in bringing to the Court the first case, so that the Court has entered into business and has begun its operations.

The second feature in our platform is that which has been alluded to pretty fully by Mr. Gilbert, who as chairman of our Committee has made the report. It is that we hope that the next step may before long be taken by which the United States and Great Britain shall accomplish this time what failed half a dozen years ago, a special treaty of arbitration between themselves, making it obligatory, instead of leaving it as at present purely permissive, to refer cases of dispute to this High Court at The Hague. We believe that that great step will be followed, as was said by a speaker who drew beautifully upon his imagination, by a treaty between America and France, and that other nations will vie with each other in their eagerness to follow the same great example.

Now that thought in our platform culminates in this beautiful sentence: "It would lead all the nations to the Hague Tribunal." What poet in his imagination can picture the results when that event shall come, when all the nations that have joined in the Hague Convention have made, each with the others, a solemn treaty binding each and all of them to refer their disputes to this great Court of Nations!

It is not for me at the present moment to indulge in any flights of imagination. I commend that to the prophets and the poets, and, if I may say so, to the ministers of God, who are here, that they may not only indulge in pleasant flights of imagination, but that they may present, first to their own souls and then to their congregations, and so to the world, this fact that is coming on with a speed that we can hardly realize. When that time has come, then we hope will shortly

follow steps toward practical disarmament, and the world's peace draw near in the lifetime of many of us.

The third thought that has been presented in this platform is the *motive* on which arbitration must rest. We have sought arbitration and argued for it a long time. What is the way in which we can really make progress? Is it not by finding out the true motive on which this great movement rests, by emphasizing that motive and making it powerful? Well, now, in my judgment—I wonder if you will all agree with me—the motive on which this movement of arbitration rests is no base and mean one: it is not that one nation is afraid of another nation; it is not purely horror of war; it is not so largely as it ought to be dread of the terrible burden which will be imposed as the result of the expensiveness of wars to-day. It rests upon the motive of justice, upon the love of justice.

Am I right in saying that this world is going to stand or fall by the success or failure of this great principle, the love of justice? Is not that what we need in every path and opening of life? When we think of the horrors that have taken place in the coal mines this last year, was it not because the two contending parties did not approach the problem with a love of justice? We need in the factories of Massachusetts a profounder love of justice. Perhaps that same need may be felt in the new factories built in South Carolina and Georgia and other Southern States. But I would begin first at home, and say that we need a keener sense of justice in Massachusetts. Often have we all heard the laboring man say that they do not want charity, but justice. And when the complaint is made that the workingmen are a little violent, or very violent, is it to be wondered at, when we remember how small have been their privileges of education, and that on the other side, among the great leaders of capital, are so many graduates of the splendid universities of the land! And therefore I should say that one of the things that we want to carry away is a love of justice to the cause of the workingman. [Applause.]

What is it that the United States needs in its relations with Cuba, what is it that the United States ought to manifest in its dealings with the ten millions of Filipinos, if it is not a manifestation of justice? That must be the dominant principle if we are going to escape horrors that I cannot describe to you.

Therefore our platform suggests that this Conference should adopt for itself and proclaim to the world a new motto: "America loves justice." [Applause.] Oh, if we were ready to accept that heartily, and if the country would take it up! Who does not feel the power that there is in a beautiful motto, in a lofty ideal, in wisdom concentrated!

May I recall to you briefly, in conclusion, some of the epigrams, some of the apothegms, which have influenced this world?

The first was General Sherman's "War is hell," which has exerted a powerful influence in making this country abhor war.

Another more beautiful epigram was General Grant's "Let us have

peace"; and persons of my age will remember what a powerful influence that has exerted.

A very beautiful apothegm was that earlier one of John Bright's, "Two nations, one people," speaking of the English and the Americans. It was used in the excitement of the Venezuelan danger when President Cleveland sent his message; it was used by the American Peace Society in its cable to Lord Salisbury: "Is it possible that England prefers war to arbitration? America prefers arbitration to war. Two nations, one people."

One of the most brutal mottoes that any of us can recall was, "The public be damned," which will never be used again, and which at once in its effect on the public mind taught capitalism that that attitude was unthinkable.

Another similar saying was, "Nothing to arbitrate," which I imagine never will be used again in this country.

Business has got its piratical motto, "Charge all that the traffic will bear."

The Associated Charities has adopted as its motto, "Not alms, but a friend," which has gone across the continent and been used in Great Britain.

I believe that these condensed expressions of the thought and wisdom of the time may exert a powerful influence. Almost the most beautiful one that I can think of at this moment is the one that I hope will be adopted and used here: "America loves justice."

There is one other more beautiful than all, used oftener than all others, of three words, used by every one every day. Shall I pause and ask who can suggest it? "Thy kingdom come." That is significant, far-reaching, revolutionary; the world is not yet ready for that. But if we can persuade the friends of peace to rest their cause upon the love of justice, we shall have made great progress. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon Mr. Macfarland for a word in seconding the platform.

"WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT!"

REMARKS OF MR. MACFARLAND ON SUPPORTING THE MOTION FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE PLATFORM.

The word that I will say must be, as a colored clergyman friend of mine in Washington says, "extemporaneous." But I cannot refrain from saying that I have derived from this Conference great inspiration and great hope, and that in the work of preparing the platform, which I was permitted to share, I was very glad to help in expressing just that feeling.

When Paul arrived at the equivalent of the Mohonk Lake Hotel on his way to Rome, it is recorded that he "thanked God and took courage." Those of us who have come here, perhaps for the first

time, are just in the mood to thank God for what has been done, to take courage for the future, and to encourage each other with the thought that what has been done has been God's work. "What hath God wrought!" the first message that went over the telegraph wire, may well be in our minds as we review the wonderful success of this movement for international arbitration.

I read in one of the speeches made years ago here this quotation, referring to the pioneers in this work :

"Who rowing hard against the stream
Saw distant gates of Eden gleam,
Nor dreamed that they did dream."

Those gates of Eden which seemed then so distant seem now so near. We have the open door of the Hague Tribunal, and we shall bring all the nations into it.

This will be done, I believe, not by our might, not by our power, nor any human power or might, but by the power of God. Human nature must be changed. I believe, as an old-fashioned Presbyterian, that nothing but the power of God can change human nature, but that that power can and will change it. I believe also that to Him, to whom a thousand years are but as one day and one day as a thousand years, the time of the consummation of our hope may be much nearer than even the most optimistic of us thinks. He can work miracles in the hearts of men. It was springtime when he blessed the bread; it was harvest when he brake. And in a year he can do what we cannot dream of his doing.

I beg leave to second the motion for the adoption of the platform, and to ask your suffrages for it.

The Chairman put the question and the platform was adopted unanimously.

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF: On behalf of the Business Committee I beg to offer the following resolution, which was proposed by the Hon. Samuel J. Barrows in his address of Thursday morning. The Committee did not think that it should be put into the platform, but they did think that it should be offered as an additional declaration :

Resolved, That to render war less probable it is important to remove the motives and excuses which make it possible. Among the most persistent motives for the waging of war in the past has been the expectation of the capture and division of the property of the enemy, of which the reward of bounties and prize money to military and naval officers and men is the modern form. We recognize and commend therefore the action of Congress in abolishing the practice of paying prize money to the officers and men in the United States service, and we commend this example to the consideration and imitation of all civilized nations.

I take great pleasure in moving the adoption of this statement

The resolution moved by Mr. Woodruff was seconded and unanimously adopted.

The Chairman recognized the Treasurer, MR. WOOD, who said :

The Treasurer is pleased to report that the members of the Conference have generously contributed a little over \$1300. Whether that is sufficient for the needs of the Business Committee I am not able to say, but in view of the fact that an extra edition of the circular and recommendations to business men is contemplated, I query whether an additional sum would not be acceptable. The Treasurer would say that he has a sheet still open.

JOHN B. GARRETT: The business of the Conference having apparently been gone through, I have the pleasure of offering for your consideration these resolutions :

Resolved, That the members of the Ninth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration place upon record their grateful appreciation of the generous hospitality of our hosts, Mr. and Mrs. Albert K. Smiley, and their sincere appreciation of the thoughtful attention and consideration of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Smiley; and further

Resolved, That we likewise record our sense of indebtedness for this further opportunity to meet under such pleasant auspices for the consideration of the important questions involved in the promotion of a sound public opinion concerning international arbitration.

In offering these resolutions and asking for their adoption by this company I want to say that we owe so much to our host that no words could possibly express the feelings which well up in the hearts of those of us who have been the partakers of his hospitality.

At the same time I have felt on this and on previous occasions, when this question has come before us, a very tender sympathy with our host, knowing the character of the man and how offensive to him must be all fulsome expressions.

My own attitude toward him is possibly unique. My acquaintance with him began more than a half century ago, when, less than two years after he had been graduated and had taken his position as instructor in his alma mater, I sat at his feet as a pupil. This acquaintance, thus begun, has gone on through life, and on many occasions we have sat side by side engaged together in the interesting problems of life, educational and others. I feel that I can say here, with a sincerity which I am sure he will not question, and without incurring the charge of being fulsome, that I have never loved him as I have loved him this week. I have never esteemed more highly than I do at this very moment his life work, as an outcome of which we have been permitted to gather in this room during these past three days and to confer upon one of the greatest problems that concern the people of the world.

Need I add more? I think not. I simply move the adoption of these resolutions, and leave them with perfect confidence in the hands of all of you who like myself have partaken of such a generous hospitality, and have felt deeply moved with the opportunities given us this week, and on previous similar occasions of this Conference, for such noble purposes.

L. E. HOLDEN: *Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen*: It is with very deep feeling that I rise to second these resolutions.

I have not the honor of having a long acquaintance with our host. I came from the West, from Ohio, by his invitation to attend this meeting, and I am under great obligations. I have been lifted to a higher plane of life and civilization in this particular; it has been good to me to listen to the ladies and gentlemen who have spoken on this great subject.

I second these resolutions with all my heart. I believe in the thoughts that have been expressed here and the purposes that you are united for. I need not say that I am thankful to our host. I am proud that he is an American citizen. I am proud of having been born in the same State where he was born. I am proud of the fact that such men have been able to go forth in the land and produce such princely palaces and do such noble service as he is doing.

THE CHAIRMAN: All who are in favor of the adoption of these resolutions will signify it by rising.

The entire Conference rose and adopted the resolutions with applause.

MR. SMILEY: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen*: I hardly know what to say; my heart is full. I have repeatedly asked the Business Committee, as my old friend, Mr. Garrett, has said, not to give any fulsome statement here. It makes me want to sink down into the next room below. But I feel that these are hearty and true on your part, and so as willingly as I can I submit. I thank you most heartily for your expressions which have bubbled out occasionally through the Conference and more especially to-night.

Nothing in the year gives me more satisfaction than the gathering of this Conference and the one in the autumn, the Indian Conference. Somebody asked me to-day if I was not tired out. I said, "No!" It gives me so much pleasure to see men and women of such character deeply interested in this great problem, and discussing it in such an intelligent and sympathetic way, that I am not tired a bit when I retire at twelve o'clock at night. It is a perfect inspiration to see in our own beloved America so many people of one heart and one mind in promoting a great movement, a world movement like this. The Czar's Rescript was the greatest event in modern history, and will be so looked upon a hundred years hence, and you have taken an active part in the same movement.

Now I want to explain my position on the peace question a little here, in a sort of family way. My most intimate friends for life have been those who advocate peace at all hazards. I used to teach, in the college where I was graduated, "Dymond on War," in which he advocates that doctrine. The more I thought of it the more I came to the conclusion that a strong arm, stronger than a policeman's club, was occasionally necessary to maintain peace in a rebellious community, and I could not any longer teach that doctrine. For while I

believed that peace at all hazards was the best thing theoretically, practically it would not work, and that the police force in any of our large cities would be of no avail without a stronger arm behind it. I am in favor of a small army as a police force to prevent insurrection and violence in our own country, and to assist in maintaining the peace of the world.

I was very much interested in the statement made by Admiral Barker about what the navy had done. He did not name all. I remember with intense interest the part which the English navy took in stopping the seizing of slaves on the coast of Africa, and preventing the transportation of them to this country and other countries where slavery existed. The navy of Great Britain stopped the slave trade. I have had a higher respect for the United States army since I have come in contact with the officers in my work as an Indian commissioner, and have seen how the officers defend the Indians and denounce the outrages committed against them by the whites in the roundest terms. I welcome here, always, officers of the army and navy. I think they are sympathetic with us in this movement.

I speak thus because I may have been misunderstood. I honor most profoundly the people with whom I have been associated all my life, who believe in peace at all hazards. The Society of Friends, of which I am a member, and the American Peace Society (which has among its membership peace men of all shades of opinion) in disseminating proper ideas about the horrors of war have done a magnificent work, for which I honor them highly. They take the gospel literally. Yet I remember that Christ used a scourge of small cords in the temple and denounced the Pharisees. As a practical man I cannot see any other way but to have a small army and a small navy.

In order to carry on a Conference of this kind successfully, we have to have in the first place a good presiding officer, a good secretary, a good treasurer and Business Committee and other officers. The Business Committee does the hard work; they have to stay indoors and not take rides, and they have my hearty sympathy. The Business Committee is selected with great care, and have done magnificent work. We have spoken of the magnificent work of our presiding officer and our other officers. I do not think it is necessary to pass resolutions in approval of them, do you? We all know we have had a good set of officers all round [applause], and a good presiding officer this evening, too. [Applause].

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to ask our good friend, Dr. Cuyler, who only arrived this evening, just to say one word to us.

REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER: You have had a glorious convention; there is no doubt of that. Every year these conferences enlarge in numbers, freedom of discussion, preciousness of thought, range of influence, power over this land and beyond our country.

It is a great fact that our Scottish-American citizen will spend over a million of dollars in building a temple of peace, a temple of

peace for the world to gather in and celebrate the triumph of the principles of arbitration. My old friend, Mr. Carnegie, has done many noble things (I speak of him as a friend, for I have known him for twenty-five years very well); he has never done a wiser thing than erecting that splendid temple of peace.

Well, when it is built I bespeak a tablet to bear one name, whoever else is or is not named in all that temple consecrated to human brotherhood and peace. If I could live long enough, or telephoning from a better world could dictate it, I would say: "On the purest marble you can place in those walls write the name of Albert Keith Smiley." [Applause.] Why, this great work here is born out of his big, God-loving, man-loving Quaker heart!

I understand that you are rendering thanks to this good brother of ours for the hospitalities of Mohonk. I suppose you all know, or perhaps have thought, that John Bunyan had this very establishment in his eye when he painted the picture of the House Beautiful that stood on the top of an elevation and only was to be reached with some climbing. I am sure that Bunyan had it in his mind, for he says that the most attractive room in all the house was called the chamber of peace. [Applause.] He also says that the gate of the House Beautiful was guarded by a porter named Discretion. [Applause.] And I am quite sure that this establishment has always had Discretion on guard, for it has succeeded in excluding the horde of fools and of cranks and of visionaries and all that class. Now you will understand what a prescient eye John Bunyan had when he pictured two or three centuries ago the establishment where we are gathered to-night.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our friend, the Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins of Philadelphia, will say a word.

REV. FLOYD W. TOMPKINS: I suppose I have been called upon as a minister at the end to give what we call in the Episcopal Church "godly admonition."

In the first place, we want to be broad-minded, to have a conception of a thing in the large. It is a great mistake to strike at small side issues. I suppose we might say about the army and navy very much as the boy said about lying: "It is an abomination to the Lord, but a very present help in time of trouble!"

Secondly, I think we should try to avoid anything in the way of "imagination." We don't want to get up in the air; we want to keep down to plain fact. Bishop Dudley of Kentucky says: "I don't want to be an angel; I want to be a man." So let us deal, not with theories or imaginations, but with facts.

Thirdly, I think we should begin to practice what we preach. If you women would go home and arbitrate with your servants, and if you men would go home and arbitrate with the boys and men who work in your factories and stores, you would accomplish something. If we would arbitrate between ourselves we should be infinitely better able to help the nations to arbitrate their difficulties.

Fourthly, we must be Americans, and realize that America is the greatest country on the face of the earth. We believe, because we are Americans, that our country is the grandest, the fairest, the noblest country that God's light ever shone upon. Let us stand by America. She is a good country to live in, and she is good for this reason, that she has a definite, strong character and reason for her existence: She exists to right wrongs. I am glad that somebody used that word "altruistic." Altruistic America,—that will go very well. It is a great thing that when there is injustice in the world and a wrong is wrought upon any nation, it is America that sets things right. Men realize that that very position of America gives us a privilege and an opportunity.

Finally, we want to realize that, after all, as has been said to-night, and cannot be repeated too many times, all this is God's work. I am glad that these meetings always open with prayer; I wish they closed with prayer, but it is in the hearts of the people. We can go home and pray over this matter. It is a good thing to know that God is ruling in this matter; that while we strive and toil and labor and speak, out of all the seed sown God will give in His own good time abundant increase.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those who were here at the Conference last year will remember with what an uplift we all went out from this room the last evening after listening to those beautiful, inspiring words of Miss Smiley; and we have asked her, and she has consented, to make the closing address this evening, which we will carry with us as our benediction.

MISS SARAH F. SMILEY: *Dear Friends*: I was put in perfect consternation this morning when I heard the announcement that I was to speak this evening, and I said that so much that was excellent had already been said there was nothing else to be thought of, and I was afraid that I would be put in the plight of saying over what I said last year. But that would not answer; there was a great limitation to what I said then about the sowing of the seed, and another thought has come to me.

There are many things which will not grow from seed. If you want a beautiful rose you can by no possibility raise it from seed. The primitive way was to raise roses from slips, as I daresay many of you have done. You cut off a slip and put it in a jar of earth, and set a tumbler over it, and place it in the sun, and water it until it gets its own root. That for a long time was thought the best way of raising roses, but it is not; it is found, strange to say, that roses do not do best on their own roots. And so now they seek out the roughest and strongest and coarsest briars possible, and they graft the beautiful, fragrant roses upon these, and so get the best results.

It has occurred to me during this Conference that that is precisely what we have seen going on with this beautiful rose of peace and goodwill to men. It does not flourish so well on its own roots

as when it finds its rough briar, and gets grafted upon the army, upon soldiers, let us say. We have heard that they are really the messengers of peace; precisely like the delicate, tender roses growing strong and beautiful upon the thorny roots. Only one has to be a little careful that the suckers do not come up at its side. [Laughter.]

Now this process of grafting by which we get these splendid results is often superseded by a more delicate process, and I think that we who are women could take kindly to that. I mean the process of budding, such a delicate work, so easily done, if we only take a little care. Just cut off a bud and make a little opening in the stock, and slip in the bud, and bind it round, and then it grows, and we have the beautiful rose with just that little care, that little effort.

That seems to me to correspond with what we might do in seizing a great many social opportunities. I think we might call the little instrument with which we made that slip our "tact," and in the "five o'clock tea" and various organizations in which women take so prominent a part they could so easily make that little opening in which they could gently slip this beautiful, tiny bud of peace and goodwill to men. And the fruit of it finally would be great and beautiful and wonderful, beyond all of their thoughts. Only they would have to be careful not to leave it too hastily, but to bind it round carefully with their own delicate fingers, to show their own personal interest, their own love, their own zeal in the matter; and so to make the thing quite secure, so that when the time came for it to grow it might really grow.

Then there is one other little lesson that I will mention very briefly, that I have been learning from my garden. My neighbor opposite me has a very old garden, forty years old, and mine is only two years old, redeemed from a wilderness almost, and she wonders how I get finer flowers than she does. I say, "*I keep at it.*" You leave yours alone mostly, and I keep stirring soil all the time, and enrich it. We must have a good soil if things are to grow. This cause of arbitration is not going to grow of itself; it must have a soil, the generous soil of kindly feeling to all mankind.

And in connection with that I was very much touched this morning with the account of the state of things in the South. I was in Richmond at the time that terrible struggle closed, and I have come in contact very much of late with some of those ladies of the South, and I know what loneliness of feeling still exists among many of them, and how they wait for our kindness, for our generosity, for our sympathy. I think we might do a great deal there in enriching the soil and in preparing in a grand way for future triumphs of peace, securing it first in our own family so that it may go out to other lands.

And there is yet one other lesson that I have learned from my garden. Three or four of the most beautiful flowers have been hybrids, such flowers as are never found unless so produced. It seems to me that this is precisely what we are going to get by a

larger union with other nations. We bring them together with their different gifts and opportunities and privileges ; we all come together in one great fellowship. In this way may we yet see such beautiful flowers as never grew before upon this earth !

Such, then, is the work for us to do ; and we are only just beginning. I have been thinking much this afternoon of some beautiful words of Archbishop Trench in which he expands this thought, and I leave them with you as a parting message :

“In doing is this knowledge won,
To see what yet remains undone ;
With this our pride repress,
And give us grace — a growing store —
That day by day we may do more
And may esteem it less.”

THE CHAIRMAN : I am sure the Conference will allow me to thank Miss Smiley in its name for the lovely parting words.

The Conference then sang, as is the usual custom at the close of the final session, the hymn, “God Be with You till We Meet Again,” and Dr. Cuyler pronounced the benediction.

MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE.

ABBOTT, REV. DR. LYMAN and MRS., 287 Fourth Ave., New York.

ALLEN, REV. DR. JOHN K. and MRS., Tarrytown, N. Y.

AMEN, PRINCIPAL HARLAN P., Exeter, N. H.

BAILEY, MRS. HANNAH J., Winthrop Centre, Me.

BAILEY, M. M. and MRS., 665 Forest Ave., Portland, Me.

BAILY, JOSHUA L., Ardmore, Pa.

BAKER, O. M. and MRS., 7 Dartmouth Terrace, Springfield, Mass.

BALCH, THOMAS WILLING, 1412 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.

BALLANTINE, REV. DR. W. G. and MRS., 321 St. James St., Springfield, Mass.

BANCROFT, WILLIAM P. and MRS., "Rockford," Wilmington, Del.

BARKER, REAR-ADMIRAL ALBERT S., Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

BARNES, GENERAL ALFRED C., 114 Pierrepont St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

BARNES, MRS. FRANCES J., 126 West 103d St., New York.

BARROWS, REV. DR. SAMUEL J. and MRS., 135 East 15th St., New York.

BARTON, ENOS M. and MRS., 143 Forty-Seventh St., Chicago, Ill.

BATCHELOR, REV. GEORGE and MRS. (*The Christian Register*), Boston, Mass.

BENEDICT, HON. ROBERT and MRS., 363 Adelphi St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

BITTING, REV. DR. W. C. and MRS., 27 Mount Morris Park, W., New York.

BRACQ, PROF. J. C., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

BRIGHT, MAJOR MARSHALL H., Tarrytown, N. Y.

BROWN, REV. DR. ARTHUR J. and MRS., 156 Fifth Ave., New York.

BROWN, JOHN CROSBY and MRS., 36 East 37th St., New York.

BROWN, LEROY S. and MRS., Cambridge, Mass.

BURR, REV. EVERETT D. and MRS., Newton Centre, Mass.

CADMAN, REV. S. PARKES and MRS., 2 Spencer Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

CHESTER, HON. ALDEN and MRS., Supreme Court, Albany, N. Y.

CHURCH, LIEUT.-COL. WM. C. and MRS., 51 Irving Place, New York.

COLLINS, RICHARD S. and MRS., 57 East 55th St., New York.

COOMBS, HON. WM. J., 63 South Portland Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

CUYLER, REV. DR. THEODORE L. and MRS., 176 South Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

DANIELL, MRS. H. W., 271 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.

DICKINSON, MRS. MARY LOW, 230 Central Park, South, New York.

DOLE, REV. CHARLES F. and MRS., 14 Roanoke Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.

EATON, GEN. JOHN and MRS., The Concord, Washington, D. C.

EDGINGTON, T. B., 17 Southern Express Bldg., Memphis, Tenn.

ELMENDORF, REV. J. and MRS., The Winthrop, New York.

EMRICK, REV. F. E. and MRS., 47 Pearl St., South Framingham, Mass.

FAGNANI, PROF. CHARLES P., Union Theological Seminary, New York.
 FAUNCE, REV. DR. WM. H. P., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 FIELD, JOHN, The Hunt, Philadelphia, Pa.
 FORBES, FRANCIS and MRS., 8 West 56th St., New York.
 FOSTER, HON. JOHN W. and MRS., 1323 Eighteenth St., Washington, D. C.
 FRANKLIN, COL. W. S. and MRS., 24 East Mt. Vernon Place, Baltimore, Md.

GARRETT, JOHN B., Rosemont, Pa.
 GARRETT, HON. PHILIP C., Logan P. O., Philadelphia, Pa.
 GIBSON, WILLIAM H. and MRS., 31 Nassau St., New York.
 GILBERT, HON. JOHN I., Malone, N. Y.
 GINN, EDWIN and MRS., 7 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.
 GOULD, MISS HELEN M., 579 Fifth Ave., New York.
 GRAHAM, REV. L. Y., 2024 Mt. Vernon St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 GRANDIN, J. LIVINGSTON and MRS., 461 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.

HALE, REV. DR. EDWARD EVERETT, 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
 HALE, MISS, 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
 HALLOCK, REV. DR. J. N. and MRS. (*The Christian Work*), New York.
 HARDY, ALPHEUS H. and MRS., 445 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 HARRIS, REV. DR. H. RICHARD and MRS., The Clinton, Philadelphia, Pa.
 HARTSHORNE, CHARLES, "Holmhurst," Merion Station, Pa.
 HASKINS, DAVID G., JR., 5 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
 HIGGINS, A. FOSTER and MRS., 100 Broadway, New York.
 HINCKLEY, REV. F. A. and MRS., 870 North 22d St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 HOLDEN, L. E. (*The Plain Dealer*), Cleveland, Ohio.
 HORR, REV. DR. GEO. E. and MRS. (*The Watchman*), Boston, Mass.
 HORWILL, H. W. and MRS. (*The Forum*), New York.
 HOUGHTON, MRS. L. S., 135 Fifth Ave., New York.
 HOWLAND, WILLIAM B. (*The Outlook*), New York.
 HUBBARD, SAMUEL F., 20 Parmenter St., Boston, Mass.

JONES, HON. W. MARTIN, Granite Building, Rochester, N. Y.

KELSEY, CHARLES E. and MRS., 201 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass.
 KING, HON. HORATIO C. and MRS., 46 Willow St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 KLINE, MAHLON N. and MRS., 429 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 KNOWLTON, HON. M. P. and MRS., 391 State St., Springfield, Mass.

LANDER, JOHN B. (*The Commercial Advertiser*), New York.
 LONDON, HON. JUDSON S., Schenectady, N. Y.
 LAPHAM, HON. OSCAR and MRS., 183 Waterman St., Providence, R. I.
 LAWSON, REV. ALBERT G., 147 Monmouth St., Newark, N. J.
 LEESON, J. R., Newton Centre, Mass.
 LEFEVRE, HON. JACOB and MRS., New Paltz, N. Y.
 LEONARD, GEORGE H. and MRS., 225 Purchase St., Boston, Mass.
 LITTLE, REV. DR. ARTHUR and MRS., 6 Melville Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
 LOGAN, HON. WALTER S., 27 William St., New York.
 LOOMIS, CHARLES BATTELL and MRS., Fanwood, N. J.

- LOVELAND, COL. F. C. and MRS., 858 West End Ave., New York.
- LOW, A. MAURICE and MRS., 1410 G. St., Washington, D. C.
- LUDLOW, REV. DR. JAS. M. and MRS., 55 Munn Ave., East Orange, N. J.
- LYNCH, REV. FREDERICK and MRS., Lenox, Mass.
- LYON, EDMUND and MRS., 505 East Ave., Rochester, N. Y.
- MACFARLAND, HON. H. B. F. and MRS., 1816 F St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- MATTESON, HON. CHARLES and MRS., 112 Prospect St., Providence, R. I.
- MAYNARD, L. A., 83 Bible House, New York.
- MCDONALD, EDGAR T. and MRS., 109 Lincoln Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- MCINTOSH, HECTOR, 605 North 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- MCKELWAY, DR. ST. CLAIR and MRS. (*The Brooklyn Eagle*), Brooklyn, N. Y.
- MEAD, EDWIN D. and MRS., 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
- MEAKIN, BUDGETT, London, Eng.
- MEAKIN, S. A. B., London, Eng.
- MILLS, PROF. HERBERT E. and MRS., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- MOWRY, DR. WILLIAM A., 17 Riverside Sq., Hyde Park, Mass.
- MOXOM, REV. DR. PHILIP S. and MRS., 83 Dartmouth Terrace, Springfield, Mass.
- MURRAY, DR. DAVID and MRS., 86 Livingston Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
- NEWTON, VIRGINIUS and MRS., First National Bank, Richmond, Va.
- PAINE, HON. ROBERT TREAT, 6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
- PALEN, MISS ANNA, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
- PATTISON, REV. T. HARWOOD and MRS., Rochester Theological Seminary,
Rochester, N. Y.
- PEEBLES, DR. JAMES MARTIN, Battle Creek, Mich.
- PENFIELD, HON. WILLIAM L., Department of State, Washington, D. C.
- PERRY, BLISS and MRS. (*The Atlantic Monthly*), Boston, Mass.
- PHILLIPS, H. C. and MRS., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
- PICKERING, HENRY and MRS., 81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
- PLATT, EDMUND P. and MRS., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- PRESTON, E. G. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.
- RAYMOND, MRS. A. V. V., Schenectady, N. Y.
- REMICK, REV. N. B. and MRS., Geneva, N. Y.
- RHOADS, MRS. EDW. G., Germantown, Pa.
- RHODES, HON. BRADFORD and MRS., Mamaroneck, N. Y.
- RICE, WILLIAM B. and MRS., 2 High St., Boston, Mass.
- RICHARDSON, CHARLES and MRS., 1307 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- RIDGWAY, WILLIAM H. and MRS., Coatesville, Pa.
- ROBINSON, REV. J. H., 47 Barker Terrace, White Plains, N. Y.
- ROGERS, PROF. HENRY WADE and MRS., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- ROSE, WILLIAM J. and MRS., Exchange Building, Boston, Mass.
- SAWYER, EDWARD and MRS., Bellevue St., Newton, Mass.
- SCUDDER, PROF. MYRON T. and MRS., State Normal School, New Paltz, N. Y.
- SEWALL, MRS. MAY WRIGHT, 633 N. Penn St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- SHRIGLEY, JOHN M. and MRS., Lansdowne, Pa.

SMILEY, ALBERT K., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
 SMILEY, DANIEL and MRS., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
 SMILEY, MISS SARAH F., 2022 F St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 SMITH, FRANKLIN and MRS. (*The Post-Express*), Rochester, N. Y.
 SMITH, FREDERICK A. and MRS., West Medford, Mass.
 SPRAGUE, DR. HOMER B., 449 Washington St., Newton, Mass.
 STODDARD, REV. DR. CHARLES A., 156 Fifth Ave., New York.
 STRONG, REV. JOSIAH and MRS., 287 Fourth Ave., New York.
 STURGIS, WILLIAM C. and MRS., 37 West 20th St., New York.
 SWIFT, D. WHEELER and MRS., 22 Oak Ave., Worcester, Mass.

TALCOTT, JAMES and MRS., 7 West 57th St., New York.
 TAYLOR, REV. DR. JAMES M. and MRS., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 TAYLOR, JOHN A., 159 South Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 TOMPKINS, REV. FLOYD W. and MRS., 1904 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 TRUEBLOOD, DR. BENJAMIN F., 31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

UCHIDA, S., Japanese Consul-General, 106 Central Park, West, New York.

VAN NORDEN, WARNER, 16 West 48th St., New York.
 VAN SLYKE, REV. DR. J. G. and MRS., Kingston, N. Y.

WADHAMS, HON. FREDERICK E. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
 WAITE, HENRY RANDALL, American Institute of Civics, New York.
 WARREN, FISKE, 220 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.
 WEEDEN, WILLIAM B. and MRS., 158 Waterman St., Providence, R. I.
 WESTON, MRS. S. BURNS, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 WHEELER, EDWARD J. and MRS. (*The Literary Digest*), New York.
 WHEELER, HON. EVERETT P., 731 Park Ave., New York.
 WHITNEY, W. BEAUMONT and MRS., 146 East Walnut Lane, Germantown, Pa.
 WILSON, PROF. GEO. GRAFTON and MRS., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 WOOD, ALEXANDER C. and MRS., Camden, N. J.
 WOOD, HENRY and MRS., 1645 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
 WOODRUFF, CLINTON ROGERS and MRS., 1920 Wallace St., Philadelphia, Pa.

APPENDIX.

A STATED INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS. THE GOVERNOR'S CORDIAL ENDORSEMENT.

The Memorial of the American Peace Society, given herewith, was presented in the Massachusetts House of Representatives by Hon. Robert Homans of Boston on the 16th of January, 1903, and referred to the Committee on Federal Relations. The Committee gave a hearing on the subject on the 11th of February.

On the 18th of February the Committee reported to the House the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted on the next day and sent to the Senate for concurrence. The resolutions were unanimously approved by the Senate on the 25th of February.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

IN THE YEAR NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THREE.

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the world to join in establishing, in whatever way they may judge expedient, an international congress, to meet at stated periods, to deliberate upon questions of common interest to the nations and to make recommendations thereon to the governments.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the senior Senator and the senior Representative of Massachusetts in Congress to be presented in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

House of Representatives, Feb. 19, 1903.

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence,

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk*.

Adopted, in concurrence,

Senate, Feb. 25, 1903.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk*.

Though not required officially to pass upon resolutions of the Legislature, the Governor of the State, Hon. John L. Bates, in the following private letter to the President of the American Peace Society, has given his cordial endorsement of the resolutions.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Boston, March 2, 1903.

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE,

President of the American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.

In reply to your favor of February 27, permit me to state that the Resolutions of the General Court of this Commonwealth, requesting Congress to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the world to join in establishing a regular International Congress, have my most cordial endorsement.

The idea of a parliament of man, at first considered visionary, is becoming accepted in this swift moving age as something not only possible of attainment, but, on the contrary, as quite probable in the future. Every effort to this end is in the interest of progressive civilization and of humanity.

Permit me to congratulate the American Peace Society on its persistent efforts to this end, and believe me,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN L. BATES.

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY'S MEMORIAL TO THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE, WITH LIST OF INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES WHICH HAVE MET SINCE 1815.

To the General Court of Massachusetts:

The Board of Directors of the American Peace Society, with headquarters in Boston, Massachusetts, respectfully petition your honorable body to adopt a resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the world to join in establishing, in whatever way they may judge expedient, a regular international congress to meet at stated periods — say, every seven years — to deliberate upon the various questions of common interest to the nations and to make recommendations thereon to the governments.

The following reasons lead us to believe that the time is ripe for such action:

1. The nations are to-day united, as never before, in commercial, economic, scientific, social and philanthropic relations, and their mutual interests are constantly and rapidly increasing.

2. The questions constantly arising, which concern them all so intimately, require their united action for proper solution, as the governments themselves have long practically recognized.

3. Within the past century about thirty important international congresses and conferences have been held for the discussion and adjustment of matters of immediate and pressing importance — an average of one about every three and a half years. These congresses, a list of the more important of which is given below, has been in large measure successful, and, besides accomplishing the ends for which they were called, have done much to remove friction and prejudice and to promote harmony between the nations, and thereby the general interests of all.

4. These congresses have not only increased in frequency in recent years, and in the number of nations represented in them, but they have also tended to become more and more legislative or quasi-legislative, as in the case of the recent Pan-American Conference, the Brussels Sugar Congress and the Hague Peace Conference.

5. The organization of an international congress of the kind here suggested, to meet at stated periods, would therefore not be an altogether new experiment, but would continue in a regular, permanent and more complete form, with the increased efficiency and usefulness which permanence and regularity bring, what has already been successfully tried on numerous occasions.

6. The idea of a world congress, on which your honorable predecessors in the General Court of Massachusetts passed strong resolutions in 1837 and 1838, has made great progress in recent years. At the Hague Peace Conference and the Pan-American Conference at Mexico City there was a strong feeling, often expressed, on the part of many of the leading delegates, that such conferences ought to be continued at regular intervals. Not a few publicists of the day feel that the time is near when, in the larger interests of humanity as a whole, a world congress with real legislative powers will have to be created.

7. There is reason to believe that the proposition to organize a regular congress for deliberation and recommendation on matters of general international concern would not meet with serious objection in any quarter among the nations. The creation of such a congress, whose recommendations would require ratification by the nations before becoming public law, would not impose upon the governments the sacrifice of any of their sovereignty and self-direction. The work of such an international body would in a few decades enable the nations to determine clearly whether it would be expedient for them to go further and to develop the organization into a world congress with legislative powers.

8. The permanent international court for the settlement of controversies between nations has been set up by the leading powers of the world and is now in successful operation. The counterpart and complement of this court, to which the reference of disputes is voluntary, would be a congress with deliberative and advisory powers, which would perform an equally important service in the development and formulation of international law as the court will do in its interpretation and application.

9. The meeting of regular international congresses for the consideration of the various common interests of the nations would exert a great and growing influence in favor of amity and mutual goodwill, would lessen the dangers of war, and assure the permanence of peace and the continuance of prosperous commercial relations.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES.

- 1815. The Congress of Vienna, which adjusted the questions left by the Napoleonic campaigns.
- 1825. The Conference of St. Petersburg, which prepared the way for the independence of Greece.
- 1831. The Conference of London, which made Holland and Belgium independent nations.
- 1856. The Congress of Paris, which disposed of the questions entailed by the Crimean War.
- 1864. The Geneva Congress, which established the International Red Cross Society.
- 1867. The Conference of London, which neutralized the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg.
- 1868. The Congress of St. Petersburg, which provided for the restriction of the use of certain types of bullets.
- 1871. The Conference of London, which modified the Paris treaty of 1856.
- 1874. The Congress of Brussels, which prepared a restatement and improvement of the laws of war.
- 1874. The first International Postal Congress, held at Berne, which organized the Universal Postal Union.
- 1875. The Metrical Diplomatic Congress at Paris, which prepared the International Metric Convention and provided for the meeting of a general Conference on Weights and Measures at Paris at least once every six years.

- 1875. The International Telegraphic Conference at St. Petersburg.
- 1877. The Conference of Constantinople, in the interests of the rights of the Porte's Christian subjects.
- 1878. The Congress of Berlin, which modified the treaty of San Stefano after the Russo-Turkish War and rearranged the map of Eastern Europe.
- 1878. International Monetary Conference at Paris, invited by the United States.
- 1881. International Monetary Conference at Paris, invited by the United States and France.
- 1884. The Berlin West African Congress, which set up the Congo Free State.
- 1885. International Prime Meridian Conference at Washington, invited by the United States and attended by representatives from twenty-six nations.
- 1889. The Marine Conference of Washington.
- 1889. The first Pan-American Conference at Washington.
- 1890. The Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference.
- 1892. International Sanitary Conference at Venice, the protocol drawn by which was signed by the delegates of fifteen nations.
- 1893. International Sanitary Conference at Dresden, in which nineteen nations were represented.
- 1896. The Universal Postal Congress, held at Washington and attended by representatives from every nation on the globe.
- 1899. The Hague Peace Conference, which provided for the organization of the Permanent International Court of Arbitration.
- 1901. The Brussels Sugar Congress, which provided for the abolition of sugar bounties.
- 1901. The second Pan-American Conference, held at Mexico City.

By order of the Board of Directors,

ROBERT TREAT PAINE, *President*.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, *Secretary*.

BOSTON, January 1, 1903.

INDEX.

(Names of speakers in small capitals.)

ABBOTT, LYMAN, address of, 47.
Alaskan Arbitration Commission, 44.
Alaskan Boundary Question, 8, 9, 11, 58, 73, 119.
Amazon, Valley of, 24, 25.
America's work for international peace, 35.
American International Congress, 39.
American Peace Society, 114, 115, 128, 137.
Anglo-French Treaty, 13.
Arbitration Treaty between United States and Great Britain, 9, 43.
Arbitration, see International Arbitration.
Argentine Republic, 6, 12.
Armaments, 46.
Asia, 61.
Athletics and peace, 32, 35.

BARKER, ALBERT S., address of, 117.
BARNES, A. C., address of, 92.
BARROWS, SAMUEL J., address of, 58.
Blaine, James G., 24.
Bolivia, 11.
BRACQ, JEAN C., address of, 52.
Bridgman, H. L., 3, 10.
BROWN, ARTHUR J., address of, 61.
Brown, John Crosby, 3, 10, 113, 117.
BURR, EVERETT D., address of, 14.
Burritt, Elihu, 38.
Business Men, circular to, 75; and international arbitration, 108.
Business organizations, 78; letters to, 78, 79.

Carnegie, Andrew, 24, 37, 104, 112.
Channing, William Ellery, 36, 40.
Chester, Alden, 3, 10.

Chile, 6, 12.
China, 8, 62, 100.
Christianity and the peace movement, 33, 70, 97, 117.
Circular to business men, 75.
Civil War and the South, 109.
Coffee, legislation on, 23.
Colleges, influence on public opinion, 31; on international opinion, 33.
Commerce, 107; influence of, on peace, 98; International Congress of, 109.
Commercial organizations, 30.
Committees of the Conference, 3, 10.
Conference, personnel of, 3, 10, 133.
Conferences, value of, 30.
Congress of the United States, 9; character of, 27; influence of public opinion on, 44.
COOMBS, WILLIAM J., 3, 10; address of, 98.
Customs regulations, 23.
CUYLER, THEODORE L., remarks of, 128.
Czar of Russia, 13, 40, 80.

Delcassé, M., 10.
D'Estournelles de Constant, 13, 53.
Diaz, Pres. Porfirio, 88.
Diplomacy, as means of peace, 20; its power, 90; in business, 106.
Disarmament, of Chile and Argentina, 7.
District of Columbia, 27.

Economic problems, 29.
Educational institutions, 30; strategic importance of, in propagating peace, 31.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 15, 20, 34, 35, 36, 39.

England, see Great Britain.

FAGNANI, C. P., address of, 68.

FAUNCE, W. H. P., 3, 10; address of, 31.

FIELD, JOHN, remarks of, 108.

FOSTER, JOHN W., 3, 5, 6, 44; address of, 72.

France, 8, 10, 11, 12, 44, 53; in China, 62; in Persian Gulf Littoral, 54; in Siam, 63.

French Parliament, 13, 53, 54.

Garrett, John B., 3, 10, 126.

Germany, 8, 10, 12, 44; in China, 62; industrial situation of, 100.

GILBERT, JOHN I., 3, 10; remarks of, 118.

GINN, EDWIN, 3, 10; address of, 102.

Grant, Ulysses S., 18.

Great Britain, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; and the United States, 43, 73, 95; in China, 62; in Persian Gulf Littoral, 54.

Guatemala, 11, 12.

Hague Tribunal, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 19, 22, 40, 119; convention adopted, 56ff; limitations of, 72; recognition by Council of Women, 80; opened by the Pious Fund Arbitration, 83.

HALE, EDWARD EVERETT, 21; address of, 22, 52, 116.

Hay, Secretary John, 8, 9, 22, 90, 88.

HIGGINS, A. FOSTER, address of, 105.

Holden, L. E., 127.

Horwill, H. W., 3, 10.

Indian Conferences, 5; value of, 23.

International American Conference, 12.

International Arbitration, 5; conferences, 5; progress in, 10; inevitable, 15; public opinion and, 28; American college and, 31; newspaper advocacy of, 42; monthly magazines

and, 45; as an ideal, 47; its limitations, 48; development of, 52; business men and, 76, 77; demonstration of women in behalf of, 79.

International Arbitration Group of French Chamber of Deputies, 13.

International Congresses and Conferences, 139.

International Council of Women, 79.

International ethics, 52, 53, 122.

International Law Association, 14.

International Peace Congress, 38, 105.

Interparliamentary Peace Union, 12, 14.

Italy, 11.

Japan, 10, 63; attitude towards arbitration, 70; in Corea, 63; in Russia, 70.

Japanese House Tax, 10, 11.

Jaurès, M., 53.

Jones, W. Martin; 3, 10.

Kelsey, Charles E., 3, 10.

KLINE, MAHLON N., 3, 10; remarks of, 112.

Knowlton, M. P., 3, 10.

Law, obedience to, 92, and footnote.

LOW, A. MAURICE, 3, 10; address of, 43.

MACFARLAND, H. B. F., 3, 10; address of, 26, 124.

Massachusetts Legislature, 45, 137ff.

Maynard, L. A., 3, 10.

MCKELWAY, ST. CLAIR, address of, 41.

MEAD, EDWIN D., address of, 35.

Meakin, Budgett, 95.

Members of Conference, 133.

Mexico, 6, 7, 10, 22; Pious Fund Case, 83ff.

Mexican War, 36, 43.

Ministers of the Church, 81.

Missionary propaganda, 50, 60, 61.

Mohonk, 41; Conferences at, 30, 68, 94, 112, 126.

Monroe Doctrine, 28, 48, 93.

MOXOM, PHILIP S., 115; address of, 18.

Naval officers, 117.

Naval prize money, 58.

Naval war code, of United States, 66; of Great Britain, 67.

Newspapers and international arbitration, 41, 52.

NEWTON, VIRGINIUS, 3, 10; address of, 109, 112.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, influence of, 34.

Officers of Conference, 3, 10.

Olney, Richard, 9, 44, 73.

Orient, peoples of, 61.

PAINE, ROBERT TREAT, 3, 10; address of, 122.

Pan-American Congress, second, 22, 45.

Pan-American Railway, 24.

Patriotism, 39, 96.

Pauncefote, Lord, 9, 44, 73, 86.

Peabody, George Foster, 74.

Peace Congresses, 38.

PENFIELD, WILLIAM L., 3, 10, 82 address of, 83.

Penn, William, 38, 93.

PERRY, BLISS, 3, 10; address of, 45.

Peru, 11.

Philippine Islands, 62.

Phillips, H. C., 3, 9, 10, 75.

Pious Fund of the Californias, 6, 10, 11, 83.

Platform of the Conference, 118, 122, 124, 125.

Porto Rico, 51.

Portugal, 11.

Preface, 4.

Press, power of, 26.

Public opinion, methods of influencing, 26; value of, 40, 50.

Quarantine regulations, 23.

Rescript, Czar's, 13, 127.

Resolutions, offered by E. E. Hale, 25; by M. N. Kline, 112; by J. C. Brown, 113; C. R. Woodruff, 125; J. B. Garrett, 126.

RICHARDSON, CHARLES, 3, 10; address of, 74.

Roosevelt, Pres. Theodore, 8, 9, 88, 110.

Rose, William J., 3, 10.

Russia, 8, 12, 44; in China, 100, 62; in Persia, 63.

Salvador, 12.

Samoa, 12.

San Domingo, 11.

Science, lessons of, 34, 35.

SEWALL, MRS. MAY WRIGHT, address of, 79.

Slavery, 43.

SMILEY, ALBERT K., 5; address of, 127, 129.

Smiley, Daniel, 3, 9, 10.

SMILEY, MISS SARAH F., address of, 130.

South African War, 97.

Spain, 12.

Stated International Congress, 40, 113, 137; prophesied, 52.

STRONG, JOSIAH, address of, 64.

Sumner, Charles, 24.

Supreme Court of the United States, 86, 91, 58, 28.

Talcott, James, 3, 10.

Thornton, Sir Edward, 84.

TOMPKINS, FLOYD W., remarks of, 129.

Treasurer of Conference, 3, 25, 126.

Treaties, neglect of, 24.

TRUEBLOOD, BENJAMIN F., 3, 37, 40, 115, 141; address of, 10, 113.

UCHIDA, S., address of, 70.

United States, 6, 7, 9, 10; and Great Britain, 43, 73, 95; and naval prize money, 58; naval war code of, 66.

Unity of the world, 64.

Van Norden, Warner, 3, 10.

Venezuela, 7, 8, 11; relation to Germany, 100.

War; decline of, 36, 37; motives for, 59; results of, 103.

War Department, report of, 51.

Wheeler, Edward J., 3, 10.

WHEELER, EVERETT P., 3, 10; address of, 55.

WILSON, GEORGE G., address of, 66.

Women, demonstration of, in behalf of international arbitration, 79.

Wood, Alexander C., 3, 9, 25, 126.

Woodruff, Clinton Rogers, 3, 9, 10, 74, 125.

